DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 933 CG 023 834

AUTHOR Veurink, Reginald Lee
TITLE The Authoritarian Personality and Marriage: An Integration of Psychoanalytic Theory and Empirical Research.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 105p.; Doctoral Research Paper, Biola University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authoritarianism; Counseling; Counseling Theories; Marital Instability; *Marriage; Marriage Counseling

ABSTRACT

Extensive interest in the authoritarian personality syndrome was piqued by the experience of World War II Nazi domination, and a proliferation of scientific inquiry ensued thereafter. Following an introduction providing a psychoanalytic perspective, this paper attempts to integrate the findings of original thinkers in this area with relevant empirical research of the last two decades. After discussion of possible etiological factors related to the authoritarian's family of origin and environment, attention is turned to the integration of research which has a bearing on the authoritarian personality and marriage. First, the authoritarian's paranoid/schizoid dynamics are discussed in terms of his or her basic manner of relating, then the authoritarian's power orientation to marital relations is discussed, and finally the cycle of privation which keeps the authoritarian mired in unsatisfying relationships is elucidated. The authoritarian's need to cope with unmet dependency needs and shame and how the authoritarian compensates by triumphantly placing emphasis on materialistic things in life are both discussed. It is also shown how the authoritarian defensively constricts awareness of the affective and sensual domains while perpetuating the privative cycle of shame and guilt. A brief section discussed the implications of treatment for the authoritarian personality and the marital dyad. It is concluded that the best approach to treatment would probably be a form of family or marital therapy which would utilize interpretive insight. (LLL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED339033

# THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY AND MARRIAGE: AN INTEGRATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

---

A Doctoral Research Paper

Presented to

the Faculty of the Rosemead School of Psychology

Biola University

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Psychology

---

by

Reginald Lee Veurink

November 1991

CG023834

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Reginald L. Veurink

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY AND MARRIAGE:

AN INTEGRATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY

AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

by

Reginald Lee Veurink

APPROVED:

Gary N. Strauss, Ph.D. Date 11/13/91
First Reader

Donald R. Collette, Ph.D. Date 11/13/91
Second Reader

APPROVED:

Dean

11/13/91
Date

Copyright © 1991 by Reginald Lee Veurink

ABSTRACT

THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY AND MARRIAGE:
AN INTEGRATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY
AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

by

Reginald Lee Veurink

Extensive interest in the authoritarian personality syndrome was piqued by the experience of World War II Nazi domination, and a proliferation of scientific inquiry ensued thereafter. Following a psychoanalytic perspective, an attempt is made to integrate the findings of original thinkers in this area, such as Adorno et al, with relevant empirical research of the last two decades. The research regarding the personality of the authoritarian is then integrated with a psychoanalytic understanding of object relations in an attempt to elucidate the marital dynamics of the authoritarian personality. Implications for psychotherapy were also briefly addressed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES ..... vii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ..... viii

DEDICATION ..... ix

DOCTORAL RESEARCH PAPER

Introduction ..... 1

Authoritarian Personality: An Early History of Analytic Theory and Research ..... 1

The Benefits of a Psychoanalytic Perspective ..... 3

Authoritarian Personality: Research Integration ..... 5

A Critique of The Authoritarian Personality by Adorno et al. (1950) ..... 5

Authoritarian Personality: Its Characteristics ..... 7

Conservatism ..... 7

Conventionality ..... 10

Externally Directed Activity/Interpersonal Passivity ..... 11

Rigidity/Intolerance of Ambiguity ..... 14

Inability to Learn ..... 16

Omnipotence/Superstition ..... 18

Idealism ..... 20

Intolerance of Affection and Sensuality ..... 21

Moralistic and Extrapunitive Hostility ..... 23

Ethnocentrism ..... 26

PAGE

Preference for Hierarchical Relationships ..... 27

Authoritarian Personality: Its Defense Mechanisms ..... 29

Splitting and Idealization of Self and Objects .....30

Projective Identification with Ingroups ..... 32

Denial and Repression of Dependency Needs .....33

Externalization of Aggressive and Libidinal Need States ..... 35

Authoritarian Personality: Its Etiological Factors ..... 38

General Familial Factors .....38

Particulars in the Development of Authoritarian Men ..... 39

Particulars in the Development of Authoritarian Women ..... 41

Lack of Differentiation from the Parents ..... 43

Social and Economic Factors ..... 45

Authoritarian Personality: Its Status as Mental Illness ..... 46

Authoritarian Personality and Marriage: Research Integration ..... 48

Authoritarian Personality: Its Paranoid/Schizoid Dynamics ..... 49

Klein's Paranoid/Schizoid Position .....49

The Schizoid Features of the Authoritarian Personality .....52

The Paranoid Features of the Authoritarian Personality ..... 53

The Ego Immaturity of the Authoritarian Personality ..... 54

Paranoid/Schizoid Dynamics in the Authoritarian Marriage ..... 57

PAGE

Authoritarian Personality: Its Power vs. Love Orientation . . . . . 61

Hierarchy in the Power-Based Authoritarian Marriage . . . . . 61

Marital Satisfaction in the Authoritarian Marriage . . . . . 64

Identification with External Authority . . . . . 70

Authoritarian Personality: Its Marital Cycle of Privation . . . . . 71

Unmet Dependency Needs and Shame in the Marital Dyad . . . . . 72

The Compensatory Emphasis on Work, Things, and Social Status . . . . . 74

Constriction of the Affective and Sensual Domains in Marriage . . . . . 76

Perpetuating the Cycle with Guilt and Manic Reparation . . . . . 80

Implications for Therapy . . . . . 82

Summary . . . . . 84

REFERENCES . . . . . 86



S

## LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1. Some Milestones of Ego Development ..... 56

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It gives me pleasure to thank those who have played a significant role in my academic career. Without these few who encouraged me along the way, I could never have come this far. First, I wish to thank Dr. Gary Strauss for his emboldening confidence in my abilities as a young psychotherapist. Without his assurances, I doubt if I would have decided to pursue further graduate studies in a program of excellence such as what Rosemead offers. Secondly, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my analyst and dear friend, Dr. Avedis Panajian. He has patiently helped me to develop into a person who has respect for his own mind and the humility necessary to learn--both qualities essential to the life of the scholar and the practicing psychologist. Finally, my deepest thanks I extend to the wife of my youth; Joy. She has willingly offered to me her time, energy and, most importantly, her interest in my work. This final project is only the culmination of years of shared effort. Typing, going to the library with me, occasionally attending classes together, keeping odd hours and even being sleep deprived from time to time, are part of her patient service of love and support. So now, honey, let's go celebrate!

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my Lord Jesus Christ--without whom all of this effort would seem to be vain and meaningless. I hope that this work will be honoring to Him and that good will come of it.

# THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY AND MARRIAGE: AN INTEGRATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

## Introduction

It was the specter of the Third Reich, and subsequent revelations of its ability to motivate people to oppression and cruelty, that sparked the interest of psychologists in the phenomena of relationships characterized by the apparent power of one party to malignantly dominate another--even to the point of causing harm. The type of personality which seeks to establish this form of relationship is now known as the authoritarian personality. It is the nature of the authoritarian personality and the unique characteristics of authoritarian marital relationships which are the focus of this paper. Of interest is an understanding of recent empirical research which bears upon the two aforementioned topics and an integration of that research which allows for a depth appreciation of the marital dynamics of the authoritarian. In order to introduce the current empirical literature, a brief history of analytic theory and research will be presented along with a short excursus on the benefits of a psychoanalytic frame of reference.

## Authoritarian Personality: An Early History of Analytic Theory & Research

Before the end of World War II, Erich Fromm (a psychoanalyst who had left Europe for the United States before the scourge of Nazism closed the Continent) was already writing of the dangers of Nazi oppression and the kind of personality that was susceptible to it. He described the sado-masochistic character--or the authoritarian character as he preferred to call it--as a person who is best characterized by his or her attitude toward authority. He said that authoritarian

characters are those who admire authority, tend to submit to authority, and at the same time want to be an authority over others. To the extent this character trait is motivated by sadism, they desire to exercise their power by dominating others. In extreme cases this includes the use of destructive means such as cruelty (Fromm, 1969).

Not long after the war, psychologists began in earnest to study this phenomenon more fully. In 1944, a major study was embarked upon by a team of Berkeley researchers with support from the American Jewish Committee. It was undertaken as a study of social discrimination in America. What began as an attempt to discover the characteristics of a person with proclivities for anti-semitic bias developed into a series of empirical studies of the authoritarian personality; thus the name of the resulting book: The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Adorno and his colleagues produced a landmark study of the individual authoritarian personality which was psychoanalytic in its theoretical underpinnings yet rigorously empirical. A reading of their work shows their reliance on Fromm's thinking. Their unique contribution was to put his ideas to the test of scientific scrutiny. Their work, which involved evaluating over 2000 subjects, has become the touchstone of hundreds of subsequent experiments and studies.

Soon after the release of Adorno's research a new and massive effort at empirically validating a system of classification of personality types was undertaken. In all, 5000 patients were classified using a new multilevel diagnostic system. Among its many merits, this study had the effect of broadening the scope of understanding the authoritarian personality to include an interpersonal emphasis. This work was accomplished under the auspices of the Kaiser Foundation beginning in 1950 and continued from 1954 through 1956 under the direction of Timothy Leary. Leary's interpersonal classification system, which was

developed from the Kaiser Foundation research, established a circular model of character types set against their bipolar opposites (Leary, 1957). The managerial-autocratic character was one of the eight types in Leary's model and it stood opposite of the self-effacing masochistic type. It is evident from reading Leary's description of the autocratic character that it corresponds to the authoritarian personality which Fromm and Adorno et al. described in their works.

About the same time that Kaiser began its study of an interpersonal approach to classification of character types, the Tavistock Clinic in London, England, formed the Marital Research Unit. Under the leadership of Henry Dicks, a sixteen year study of the marital dyad--involving more than 2,000 marriages--was conducted from a psychoanalytic perspective. Dicks leaned heavily on Fairbairn's theory of personality in his understanding of marital dynamics (Dicks, 1967). This approach was unique at that time in that it looked at the marital relationship itself as the object of study. The authoritarian personality was now viewed as a phenomenon inseparable from its relational [i.e., marital] and social context. Although Dicks did not confine himself only to authoritarian dynamics in marriage, he did address these dynamics at some length.

The Benefits of a Psychoanalytic Perspective in this Study

Psychoanalytic theory allows for an integration of dynamic, interactive trait-clusters which operate at both conscious and unconscious levels of awareness. It provides the reader with a parsimonious personality theory, for it presents what is probably the most comprehensive theory of the mind. Furthermore, the contributions of the theorists of the British school of psychoanalysis provide ample flexibility to explain marital psychodynamics in terms of the personality functions of the individuals in relationship (Dicks, 1967). So, the primary benefit which psychoanalytic thinking yields to a consumer of the scientific research on this complex topic is to provide an historically rich conceptual structure which can

impart meaning to an otherwise dazzling array of experiments and studies. This is a crucial factor for the clinician who must attempt to integrate the research literature into his or her practice of clinical psychology.

It is quite a different story when the reader of the scientific literature encounters much of the later social psychology research in areas related closely to the topic. When one researches topics such as: (a) dominance and submission; (b) marital power and marital satisfaction correlations; and (c) marital and family systems (in such complex terms as power-processes perspectives, outcome perspectives, and socio-cultural perspectives); etc., one gets the impression that the researchers are captains of rudderless ships who have lost their historical moorings. It soon becomes apparent that the researchers have not been able to agree on definitions of such basic tenets as power itself. Much of the research seems difficult to integrate because one does not have a sense that the different studies are truly assessing the same variables. Furthermore, most of the social psychology research fails to relate personality variables to power processes in marriage at all. This critique has been sounded by Rasmussen (1986) who has suggested that a return to a psychodynamic understanding is crucial for understanding the exchanges between any couple. So, the perspective of this study is grounded in the analytic thinking of the above cited research--especially that of Adorno et al. The marital dyads on which this paper will focus, in particular, are those involving the authoritarian personality type.

An attempt will be made to integrate the research relevant to an analytic view of the authoritarian personality. Adorno et al. (1950) will provide an initial framework for such integration. Their work will be briefly critiqued, therefore, before examining what the research indicates are the characteristics of the authoritarian personality. The research on authoritarian-related defenses and possible etiological factors that contribute to its development are also examined.

This provides the preparation to focus more specifically on matters dealing with marriage; specifically on an analytic integration of the recent empirical literature (approximately the past 20 years) touching on the dynamics of the authoritarian personality and marriage. This includes correlating: (a) the relational aspects of Klein's paranoid/schizoid and depressive positions with Adorno's high scoring authoritarians, (b) the power orientation of authoritarians in marriage and their difficulties in forming satisfying love relationships, and (c) the cycle of privation that perpetuates unsatisfying marital relationships with authoritarian personalities. Finally, implications for therapy with individual authoritarians and authoritarian marital dyads will be briefly addressed.

## Authoritarian Personality: Research Integration

This section examines the body of research which has been generated over the past two decades and attempts to integrate those findings with the work of Adorno et al. (1950). Research relevant to the authoritarian personality is brought forward to elucidate: (a) the authoritarian's characteristics, (b) the nature of his or her defense mechanisms, (c) possible etiological factors in the authoritarian's personality development, and (d) the issue of psychopathology inherent in the authoritarian personality structure and whether the authoritarian should be considered mentally ill. First, however, a brief critique of Adorno et al. (1950) is presented.

### A Critique of The Authoritarian Personality by Adorno et al. (1950)

Adorno et al. can rightfully be credited with originating the scientific inquiry into the makeup of the authoritarian personality. Their study was exhaustive and rigorous. Over 2,000 persons were evaluated--although with some bias towards the middle-class and a highly educated strata of the population. Four diagnostic scales were developed and validated (the Anti-Semitic [A-S] Scale, the Ethnocentrism [E]

Scale, the Politico-Economic Conservatism [P-E-C] Scale, and the Fascism [F] Scale), and analytically structured interviews were extensively used as an independent means of cross validating the results of the administered scales. The study was cohesive from a theoretical perspective in that all the primary researchers were guided by common analytic constructs in developing the questionnaire items, and in conducting and evaluating the interviews. However, in this lies also a potential weakness of the study.

Because the teams utilized similar concepts and even similar test items in the different scales, there exists the possibility that the validity coefficients they obtained between the scales is due to a direct confounding of the scales rather than independent measures tapping into the same underlying variable. Ray (1980b) in particular, has been critical of the validity of the F Scale. He claims that it is vulnerable to an acquiescent response set. He also claims that high scorers on the F Scale do not necessarily behave in an authoritarian (i.e., dominating) manner--that is, it lacks behavioral validity and thus cannot be used to predict authoritarian behavior (Ray, 1976; Heaven, 1977). However, Adorno et al. never claimed to be making a behavioral assessment. On the contrary, they claimed to be assessing the potential for anti-democratic bias which might or might not be expressed.

A methodological problem also exists with how the interviews were designed. Not only did the interviewers and evaluators not work blind to the purposes of the study, but they were privy to the results of previously administered scales. In fact, scale results obtained from individual subjects were used to help structure the subject's later interview. The danger here is of deciding the results in advance along theoretical lines--then constructing tests to prove the hypothesis, interviewing to prove the test, and eventually arriving at a self-fulfilling prophecy.

A third criticism that could be leveled against Adorno et al. is that they seem to hold a consistent bias against the high scorer, i.e., the type of personality which

they characterized as authoritarian. Although they paid lip service to addressing the characterological faults of the low scorers, their more intense terms of disapproval and delation were reserved for the character traits of the high scorers. In the end they seemed to equivocate when it came to deciding whether the authoritarian personality was mentally ill per se. Although their own data did not support such a contention, they proposed the idea more than once (a prejudice of their own no doubt) only to contradict themselves elsewhere. It is interesting to note that their predecessor, Erich Fromm (1969), did not consider the authoritarian personality necessarily neurotic. In fact, he believed most were not. Leary (1957) also did not consider the autocratic person as necessarily mentally ill. Rather, he comments that mental health clinics infrequently see this type of patient.

Whether the authoritarian personality is or is not mentally ill and whether or not the scales developed by Adorno et al. (1950) have produced an accurate picture of the nature of the authoritarian personality, can best be answered in the light of later research which this highly heuristic study has inspired. In spite of their own prejudices and methodological weaknesses, Adorno and his colleagues provided a starting point from which to organize subsequent inquiries. It is to those inquiries that attention is now turned. To avoid difficulties stemming from over-generalization, only Western research is included in this review. Ray showed in two studies (1979b, 1980c) there were no significant cross-cultural differences in either authoritarian attitudes or authoritarian personality when sample measurements were taken in Los Angeles, Sydney, London, Glasgow, and Johannesburg

Authoritarian Personality: Its Characteristics

The integration of the empirical research can be begun by examining a number of characteristics which comprise what Adorno et al. (1950) called the authoritarian personality syndrome. (The other syndromes which they mentioned in their

discourse will not be considered.) One of the characteristics of the authoritarian personality, which is commonly referenced in the empirical literature, has to do with a tendency towards conservatism.

Conservatism. Adorno et al. (1950) theorized that the ideological conservatism of the ethnocentrist (and thus the authoritarian personality as is seen below) would involve supporting the American status quo, being resistant to social change, supporting conservative values, and professing a bias towards laissez-faire individualism vis-à-vis the balance of power among business, labor, and governmental organizations. But the Berkeley researchers found that ethnocentric individuals could not be differentiated based simply upon group membership in organizations which espouse conservative ideologies; nor was there any simple correlation to family income. No broad socioeconomic grouping showed anything approaching ideological homogeneity. Any differences found in group means were attended by large standard deviations indicating a great deal of overlap between groups. Thus it was concluded that it is not membership in conservative groups per se, nor the mere identification with a certain strata of the population which would predict an authoritarian personality style. Adorno et al. interpreted the data to indicate that people may support organizations for many different reasons, and it is the unique meaning that a choice to affiliate with a conservative group has for the individual which would have to be ascertained. They concluded that sociological and economic factors play a more indirect and complex role than previously thought. These factors appear to interact with the personality of the individual in ways that are not immediately obvious.

In subsequent studies Shikiar (1975) and Brant, Larsen, and Langenberg (1978) were able to show definite trends correlating affiliation with conservative groups (voting for conservative political party officials) with measures of authoritarianism. Brant, Larsen, and Langenberg found Wallace/ Reagan

supporters to be more authoritarian than Ford/Carter adherents and that supporters of various liberal candidates were the lowest of all on measures of authoritarianism. Shikiar found significantly increased authoritarianism in supporters of Nixon compared to followers of McGovern. He also found significantly increased authoritarianism in political party switchers in the 1972 presidential election. In this study these party switchers were pro-Nixon democrats. This surprising finding about switchers illustrates the validity of the caution which Adorno et al. urged upon their readers; i.e., in exercising care not to stereotype members of an ideologically bound organization based upon membership alone. Not all authoritarian personalities who affiliate with a political party join the Republican Party--even though it is currently the major conservative party in America.

In another study of the 1972 presidential election (Lindgren, 1974) utilized an interesting methodological twist. In each of the states an analysis was done in order to correlate the state voting record with demographic data. This data served as indices of political authoritarian tendencies in the state population as a whole (such as high school dropout rate, highway death rate, murder rate), indices of social status (income level and educational attainment), and social involvement (volunteer rate for the Peace Corps). It was found that political conservatism in the voting record was positively related to the type of social deficiencies which are associated with authoritarian political solutions. It was negatively related to indices of social status and social involvement. The negative correlation to income may go contrary to common wisdom but other research has borne out Lindgren's findings. For example, Ray (1985) found authoritarians tend to be middle, not lower, socioeconomic class. Another interesting aspect of this study is the use of variables that relate to social maturity. Highway death rate, murder rate, and high school dropout rate all present behavioral aspects of possible inadequate social

maturity. High volunteer rates for the Peace Corps would be an index of high social maturity. This study raises a question regarding the social maturity of the authoritarian personality. The topic of poor ego development (and thus a lack of social maturity) in the authoritarian personality is discussed later in this paper.

Conventionality. Closely connected with the idea of conservatism is that of conventionality. Yonge and Regan (1978) conducted a study of female sex role expectations in authoritarian and nonauthoritarian university students. In spite of the liberal leanings of a student population, they found that the authoritarians held more traditional expectations across all five of their role classifications. On two of the five scales the men were significantly more traditional than the women. Similarly, Larsen and Long (1988) found authoritarianism correlated significantly with the Traditional Egalitarian Sex Role Scale. The results showed once again a connection between traditional conventionality and authoritarian attitudes. Like Yonge and Regan (1978), the study by Larsen and Long showed females expressing more egalitarian attitudes than males.

Adorno et al. (1950) went beyond merely studying the correlational facts to suggest possible dynamics involved with the authoritarian's conventional bent. Adorno's colleagues found that while they could not reliably predict a person's score on their Ethnocentrism Scale (E) from the subject's group memberships or income level, they could accurately predict the subject's standing on the E Scale on the basis of his agreement or disagreement with his father's political party preference--regardless of the subject's actual affiliation. The researchers did not even need to know the father's politics. This correlation existed in spite of the fact that they found that children of authoritarian parents tended to be less authoritarian. The key factor was the extent to which the subject conformed to the father's standards.

The authoritarian's need to conform to conventional mores also appears in matters of religion. Subjects who rejected the religion of their parents were found by Adorno et al. to be far less authoritarian--in fact, non-adherents were assessed to be very nonauthoritarian as a group. However, to the extent the subject agreed with the parent's mutual religious preference, the authoritarian scores showed a higher trend. While religious subjects as a group did not test out to be highly prejudiced, Adorno et al. have concluded that those religious subjects who did test high on the A-S Scale (a test of prejudice which is indicative of authoritarianism) have accepted their religion primarily as a matter of convention rather than as a genuine expression of an intrinsic faith. Adorno et al. concluded that the authoritarian, by professing conventional ideals and denying shortcomings, identified with a phantasy of a powerful social majority. (In this paper, phantasy will be used to denote an unconscious mental process whereas the term fantasy will denote a preconscious or conscious mental process.) It seemed that as long as the authoritarian subjects perceived themselves to be average or normal they considered themselves "all right" and they felt like they belonged. Deviation was apparently not easily accepted. Theoretically, what may lie behind this tendency is a lack of individuation from their parents. This issue is addressed at greater length later in this paper.

Externally Directed Activity and Interpersonal Passivity. Typical male authoritarian personalities portrayed themselves in interviews (Adorno et al., 1950) as independent, possessing leadership qualities, and displaying such virtues as determination, industry, decisiveness, tough-mindedness, extraversion, and will power. The women tended somewhat to think of themselves as feminine, soft, and receptive. Such qualities seem to be more pseudo-masculine and pseudo-feminine rather than truly masculine or feminine. Theses traits appear defensive in nature with a probable purpose of excluding tendencies towards the polar

opposite orientation from self-awareness altogether. The male authoritarian resists any healthy passivity (in the receptive feminine sense) and any form of interpersonal dependency which might allow anxiety due to helplessness to break through. The pseudo-feminine high scoring female resists any conscious awareness of her aggressive side; but it exists none the less. Adorno's research identified these women as commonly communicating crude but indirect expressions of aggression towards men in their interviews.

In keeping with the above description of the authoritarian personality from Adorno et al. (1950), Heaven, Connors, and Trevethan (1987) also found that authoritarian males were typically tough-minded and extraverted while submissive females tended to be introverted and neurotic. The passivity of the authoritarian personality can also be seen empirically in evidence that the authoritarian was found to lack independence of thought and critical judgment while low scorers display greater autonomy of thought. For that reason he or she tends to be suggestible and gullible (Adorno et al., 1950). This difference was significant for both men and women ($p < .01$).

There is a substantial cost of such rigidly maintained forms of externalizing activity and repression. It is a loss of creativity and an unintentional passivity in those areas which are excluded from awareness; especially the ability to identify with the opposite sex in interpersonal relationships. In place of creativity and passion one often finds unproductive activity of a manic sort which limits depth interpersonal involvement. Erich Fromm (1947) described poetically the kind of constricted (and in his mind nonproductive) activity in which the authoritarian engages so as to avoid stirring up anxiety. He stated:

> A common type of nonproductive activity is the reaction to anxiety, whether acute or chronic, conscious or unconscious, which is frequently at the root of the frantic preoccupations of men today. Different from anxiety-motivated activity, though often blended with it, is the type of activity based on submission to or dependence on an authority. The authority may be feared,

> admired, or "loved"--usually all three are mixed--but the cause of the activity is the command of the authority, both in a formal way and with regard to its contents. The person is active because the authority wants him to be, and he does what the authority wants him to do. This kind of activity is found in the authoritarian character. To him activity means to act in the name of something higher than his own self. He can act in the name of God, the past, or duty, but not in the name of himself. The authoritarian character receives the impulse to act from a superior power which is neither assailable nor changeable, and is consequently unable to heed spontaneous impulses from within himself. (p. 86)

In terms which have been used in this paper, the constricted yet manic sort of activity found in the authoritarian is driven by a demanding conscience which is moralistic and which demands absolute obedience. This conscience is an internalized higher power--one of the possible authorities of which Fromm spoke. It operates to limit personal involvement by keeping the authoritarian focused on superficialities and externally directed activity. This naturally keeps the authoritarian quite unaware of his or her own depth.

These overly determined behaviors can produce a lot of things and achieve lofty goals. In fact, Ray and Lovejoy (1983) found that achievement motivation (as well as dominance) correlated highly with Ray's behavioral measure of authoritarianism. However, this pressured and rigid activity cannot be said to be truly creative in the sense of growth or developing something new. So also reads the findings of the researchers. Authoritarianism and creativity are often found to correlate negatively (Grossman & Eisenman, 1971; Eisenman, 1982). Heinzen, Teevan, and Britt (1988) did not find a negative correlation between creativity and a projective measure of achievement (which served as an operational measure of authoritarianism following the findings of Ray and Lovejoy cited above). However, these findings are suspect on the grounds that the measure of creativity used by Heinzen, Teevan, and Britt was a self-descriptive check list which was susceptible to the influence of social desirability. As will be discussed below, the authoritarian is quite prone to describe him or her self in ideal terms in the first

place--thus obfuscating any m ning that the directionality of the correlations (which were so slight as to be statistically non-significant) might have possessed.

The authoritarian mind which is ruled by conventional moralism will not be free enough to allow significant deviations from the norm. A good example of this phenomena on a societal level would be the resurgence of the neoclassical architecture of Nazi Germany. Building projects were carried out in Berlin on a massive scale and they were quite impressive. However, they were not creative; they were conformist. The same holds true for the militaristic neoclassical art and classical architecture of Napoleon's French Empire. Much of it was regressive and sterile--a copy of an old convention at best. Figures appearing in paintings were idealized, ancient Greek and Roman buildings were duplicated precisely and Canova--undisputedly the foremost sculptor of the Empire--copied ancient statuary with modern pointing machines and "created" art in a factory-like environment. His art was not an attempt to imitate nature as it had been for the Greek masters. Instead, his art became a copy of art (Fleming, 1966).

Rigidity and Intolerance of Ambiguity. Rigidity and avoidance of ambiguity--especially ambivalence toward significant others--were found by Adorno et al. (1950) to mark the authoritarian personality. These characteristics established a significant differential criteria ($p < .01$) between high and low scorers. Authoritarians tended to operate in a dogmatic fashion guided by a set of conventional rules that they applied to both themselves and others. Adorno et al. claimed that, unlike the nonauthoritarian personalities, the authoritarians tended to take over traditional and fixed concepts and ideals without critical scrutiny. They also tended to think in terms of such fixed polarities as black and white, good and bad, legal and illegal, always and never, all or none, etc. This rigidity was often most marked in the realms of interpersonal experience. Idealization of loved ones was one example of this type of constricted thinking. The tendency to superimpose

stereotypical categories on one's own experience with other people was another common example.

Ray (1980a) claimed to show in a study based upon a mailed questionnaire that authoritarians are the opposite of the above description--tolerant of ambiguity and not rigid. However, it is unlikely that he received a truly representative sample, as he claimed. People who are intolerant of ambiguity are not likely to cooperate by sending in forms which ask personal questions when they are kept unsure as to their purpose and use. In a later study, Ray (1981) did in fact show significant correlations between scores on a behavioral scale to assess authoritarianism, rated aggressiveness, and rigidity.

Wright and Phillips (1979) were not able to show a relationship between measures of authoritarian characteristics and what they called probabilistic thinking. However, when their subjects were asked to estimate numerically how certain they were of their answers, authoritarian subjects were more apt to err by claiming 100% certainty. They also made less fine discriminations of numerical probability than did nonauthoritarians. So, while Wright and Phillips did not show support for their main hypothesis that authoritarians were less capable of probabilistic thought, they did provide evidence of a rigid "all or nothing" type of thinking.

In a study of authoritarian and nonauthoritarian subjects who were assessed for tolerance to ambiguity in an autokinetic test situation, the subjects were asked to respond to ambiguous visual stimuli. Zacker (1973) found that authoritarian subjects reported movement of light sooner and developed their own internal norms more quickly than the nonauthoritarians--thus reducing the ambiguity to which they were exposed. The authors reported these findings consistent with the conception of the authoritarian personality as being intolerant of ambiguity.

Kline and Cooper (1984) were able to identify an independent factor they related to authoritarianism in a factorial analysis using the Cattell 16PF and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. This factor reinforced their view of authoritarianism as being "rigid rule following." The factor which they identified was that of an obsessional personality. On the basis of their study they argued for the utility of the concept of authoritarianism in the theory and measurement of personality.

Finally, another study was conducted by Rigby and Rump (1982) in which various personality measures relevant to authoritarianism were subjected to polynomial trend analysis and a multivariant analysis. Intolerance of ambiguity, intolerance of complexity, dogmatism, cognitive simplicity, and inhibition of both creative independence and emotional activation all showed a linear relationship with measured authoritarianism. The authors concluded that the personality characteristics clustered together sufficiently to warrant labeling them as an authoritarian syndrome.

Inability to Learn. The above descriptions of the authoritarian personality make clear the individual's diminished capacity for individuated experience--i.e., such an individual has difficulties in learning. The authoritarian personality can appear to be obtuse--especially in social matters or issues involving psychological functioning. According to Adorno et al. (1950), he or she oversimplifies human events because of difficulty taking into account all of the facts of real life situations which do not fit a rigid authoritarian view of the world. Nor can the authoritarian take into account deeper affect laden responses which might threaten to overwhelm him or her with anxiety. This, however, is not a dire comment on the intelligence of the authoritarian nor is it meant to convey any sweeping limitation of the many cognitive skills the authoritarian individual may possess. Adorno et al. found little correlation between intelligence and scores on measures of

authoritarian personality. What is being asserted here is that the authoritarian will tend to utilize new experience--especially in the area of object relations--primarily to mechanically reinforce established symbols and belief systems. The authoritarian tends to prejudge individuals apart from experience. He or she approaches a new and strange person with doubt and rejection (rather than with curiosity, interest, and receptivity) and rigidly maintains a closed mind to any experience which might not conform to prior prejudices (Adorno et al, 1950).

This kind of so-called thinking is the antithesis of what Fromm (1947) called productive thinking. Productive thinking is interactive with the object of interest and allows for the thinker to be personally impacted at a meaningful level. Fromm described it this way:

> In the process of productive thinking the thinker is motivated by his interest for the object; he is affected by it and reacts to it; he cares and responds. But productive thinking is also characterized by objectivity, by the respect the thinker has for his object, by his ability to see the object as it is and not as he wishes it to be..To be objective is possible only if we respect the things we observe; that is, if we are capable of seeing them in their uniqueness and their inter-connectedness..Objectivity does not mean detachment, it means respect; that is, the ability not to distort and to falsify things, persons and oneself. (Fromm, 1947, pp. 104-105)

It is impossible to disengage oneself from one's own distorting instinctual process and engage the object of interest "objectively" as Fromm describes above when, as it appears is the case with the authoritarian personality, the person involved does not possess proper symbol formation. To detach from one's instincts, without an adequate capacity for adequate symbol formation would create an overwhelming state of frustration because a capacity for symbol formation is necessary to thinking containing thoughts.

Theoretically, part of the dynamic involved in the authoritarian's difficulty in learning lies in the fact that he or she does not experience others as truly separate individuals; neither does he or she experience others as whole persons. Rather,

others are projectively experienced according to well established idiosyncratic conventions which are often immutable and stereotypic. Such conventions serve the purpose of only confirming existing inner world object relations. An object is the component in the mental representation of an instinct which is phantasied to satisfy a wish, need or desire--usually a person or part of a person, in relationship with the self, which is imbued with impulses related to the instincts of the subject (Hinshelwood, 1991). Thus, new experience with others cannot readily be integrated at an affective level and will likely not result in new learning and personal growth. Often these idiosyncratic conventions are reinforced for the authoritarian by conventional social mores which are applied indiscriminately to new experience.

Omnipotence and Superstition. The authoritarian subjects in the study by Adorno et al. (1950) tended to engage in wishful denial of genuine causality--especially if it involved socio-psychological explanations. In place of a logical system of causality based upon experience grounded in reality, the authoritarians maintained a system of superstitious beliefs which grossly distorted reality. Dynamically, superstition serves to take the place of thinking and a reasoned interpretation of reality in a mind which may not be capable of thinking. So, it is not surprising that Adorno et al. found authoritarian individuals to explain personal shortcomings in terms of heredity, physical or accidental factors, superstition or something akin to fate, while the nonauthoritarian subjects were found to reference their childhood or psychological factors much more frequently when explaining their behavior.

It should be noted that all of the above factors offered by the authoritarians as causal explanations of their personal behavior appeared to lie outside of the instrumental control of the person. It seems that the authoritarian tends to shift personal responsibility from himself or herself. In so doing he or she creates a

personal sense of underlying powerlessness and hopelessness in the possibility for change. According to Adorno et al. (1950), it is almost as though the ego is inadequate and the authoritarian has given up on controlling his or her own life--and thus has given up on personal growth and development. The authoritarian personality chooses instead to rely upon, and steadfastly submit to, a power greater than himself or herself.

In Fromm's view (1969), the authoritarian loves being submitted to fate. Being committed to and dependent upon a supremely higher power not only exempts the authoritarian from the necessity to seize the initiative and act on his or her own power (and simultaneously to be confronted with his or her own powerlessness), but it also provides for an omnipotent identification with a much higher power. The authoritarian gains strength by leaning on superior power which is unassailable and immutable. The authoritarian lacks true potency for creative acts but substitutes for it omnipotence gained through projective identification. Projective identification is the phantasied projection of parts of the self into an object which may result in the object being perceived as having acquired the characteristics of the projected part of the self or in the self becoming identified with the object of its projection or both (Segal, 1974). The superstitious world of the authoritarian personality is often more related to unconscious phantasy than to reality. This is seen so clearly in a unique study by Boshier (1973) in which a hidden camera was aimed to record the behavior of pedestrians who encountered a ladder. It was found that for people 40 years of age and older, a correlation existed between conservatism (as a measure of authoritarianism) and the superstitious behavior of refusing to walk under a securely fastened ladder--even when the subjects had to go out of their way or wait in line during rush hour to avoid the ladder. Some of the subjects may have avoided the ladder out of safety concerns. However, for superstitious subjects, it appears as though bad persecutory

parts of the self (hateful, self-destructive aspects of the mind) were projected into the environment (or fate) and subsequently the subjects acted fearfully--perhaps fearing that the environment would single them out (a grandiose, paranoid phantasy) and retaliate with catastrophic bad luck (a projective phantasy of omnipotent and punitive parts of self returning from a non-containing environment to retaliate for not superstitiously submitting to the rule of fate regarding ladders).

Idealism. The authoritarian personality tends to idealize the group with which he or she identifies. The primary group, of course, is that of the parents. Adorno et al. (1950) found that parents were often described by high scorers in generalized, undifferentiated terms which emphasized conventional attributes and glorified physical characteristics. Nonauthoritarians tended to describe their parents with a more objective appraisal. The difference between the two groups was significant ($p < .01$) and held true for both men and women. It should be noted that one effect of the repression of critical feelings towards the original parents would be to spare the authoritarian personality any awareness of resentment and disappointment. This would allow the identification with ideal objects to continue unabated and enable the authoritarian to avoid the experience of loss and depression.

The authoritarian personality also has a bent towards self-glorification. It is easy to see how interconnected self-idealization is with idealization of the parental couple. The authoritarian personality identifies with his or her own idealizing distortions. Adorno et al. found that high scorers tended to describe themselves in predominantly positive traits--another example of false and deceptive thinking. They also tended to emphasize that they had overcome weaknesses, obstacles, and victimization in their lives. Once again the difference between the high and low scorers was significant at the $p < .01$ level. In a shifting manner the authoritarian

idealizes any greater social unit with which a current identification is maintained; and thus the authoritarian is enhanced in his or her own eyes.

Intolerance of Affection and Sensuality. Adorno et al. described the authoritarian personality as anti-intraceptive--a term which denotes a "dominance of feelings, fantasies, speculations, aspirations--an imaginative, subjective human outlook" (Adorno et at., 1950, p. 235). The same authors also described the authoritarian personality as extraceptive. Extraception is "the tendency to be determined by concrete, observable, physical conditions and facts" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 235). According to them the authoritarian is afraid to think about human phenomena because he or she might think wrong thoughts. Furthermore, the authoritarian is afraid of genuine feelings because his or her emotions might get out of control. Adorno et al. claimed that this is a sign of ego weakness (this is addressed at greater length below). The authoritarian personality is against prying, unnecessary talk, and examining inner conflict. He or she will typically turn attention to positive thoughts instead. This general attitude leads to a devaluation of human beings and an impoverishment of personal relationships.

The authoritarian invests excessive importance in physical objects and he or she tends to these things with inordinate care. For this reason the authoritarian will work better in relation with things rather than people--the authoritarian may actually become disruptive when required to deal with personal needs and human emotions. Adorno et al. (1950) found a highly significant difference between the authoritarian and nonauthoritarian subjects regarding their attitudes towards money and physical property. High scoring subjects tended to view property as an extension of the self--and thus an end in itself. Low scorers tended to view money and property merely as a means to an end. It appeared to Adorno et al. that the high scorers sought basic security and independence in the accumulation of goods--a need that seemed to them as functionally autonomous and insatiable.

On the other side of the coin, Adorno et al. noted that authoritarian personalities tended to maintain greater interpersonal space as a means of shunning closeness. In a well designed study, Ray (1984) found that authoritarians did indeed maintain greater interpersonal space than did nonauthoritarians--slightly more space with superiors than with peers. The differences between the authoritarian personalities and the nonauthoritarians was highly significant in both cases. Ray hypothesized that the greater interpersonal space may be due to a degree of wariness inherent in conservatism. Later in this paper this phenomenon will be seen to relate to a paranoid position which the authoritarian commonly exhibits.

The authoritarian's intolerance of the sensual can be clearly seen in what Adorno et al. (1950) called a moralistic rejection of the id. They found that the high scorers frequently rejected the purely erotic and sensual or they avoided genuine sexuality by frequently changing partners. Kelley (1985) conducted a study in which she found that authoritarians in particular had significantly negative reactions to same sex masturbatory slides (regardless of the sex of the subjects) when compared to egalitarian subjects. She hypothesized that family of origin attitudes towards sexuality--and in particular towards masturbatory practices--might help explain the authoritarian's excessive disapproval of the sexual practices of others. In a related work Byrne, Cherry, Lamberth, and Mitchell (1973) found that highly authoritarian marital couples were more sexually aroused by erotic stimuli which depicted a variety of sexual themes. However, authoritarian couples also reported more negative emotional arousal, judged more of the material to be pornographic, and they advocated greater censorship of erotic materials. The themes which authoritarians reported most arousing were those stimulus materials which were within the normal range of auto and heterosexual activity. Byrne et al. suggested that their results indicate a general negative orientation toward human sexuality

on the part of authoritarians. In the least, it represents a constriction of what authoritarians find enjoyable. Furthermore, the results of the above two studies point to the inevitability of internal conflict over instinctual impulses and phantasy.

Moralistic and Extrapunitive Hostility. According to Adorno et al. (1950), the authoritarian personality has had to accept excessive external restrictions on the satisfaction of his or her needs and therefore harbors underlying hostility. For the authoritarian, one outlet for his or her aggressive impulses is a displacement of hostility towards outgroups which are viewed, with righteous indignation, as being inferior. Adorno et al. found that the authoritarians tended to engage in moralistic condemnation of others while nonauthoritarian subjects tended to be more permissive in their attitude towards others. The difference in means was significant ($p < .01$). Adorno et al. also found that authoritarians were quite extrapunitve--that is, they demonstrated a tendency to blame others rather than themselves. This trend was present for both men and women but it was more pronounced in the authoritarian males. Adorno et al. saw excessive indulgence in righteous indignation towards others as serving the double purpose of externalizing unacceptable traits in oneself and, at the same time, displacing one's hostility which might otherwise be turned against powerful ingroups--that is, the parents or representations thereof.

Ray (1980b) found that authoritarians indeed were more hostile as Adorno et al. had claimed. He measured authoritarianism with a balanced version of the F scale and his own behavioral measure for authoritarianism--the Directiveness Scale--to avoid some of the problems with the F scale (such as acquiescent response set) used by Adorno et al. Raden (1980) also found authoritarian personalities to be more aggressive than nonauthoritarians. In a Buss type of learning experiment, high authoritarians gave significantly higher levels of shocks to a trainee

confederate than did low authoritarians. The findings unexpectedly showed that the aggression was generalized and that race differences did not play a role in the shock levels. The absence of an interaction between authoritarianism and the race of the victim might be explained by the fact that university students comprised the subject pool for the experiment; and university students as a group may tend to be less racially prejudiced.

Empirical evidence of the moralistic and extrapunitive tendencies of authoritarian personalities abounds. In one experiment using mock juries composed of university students, Bray and Noble (1978) found that high authoritarians reached guilty verdicts and imposed more severe sentences than did low authoritarians. High authoritarians showed more of a tendency towards verdict changes following discussion of the cases--whether due to an open mind or insecurity of mind is difficult to say. However, it was clear that deliberations tended to result in recommendations for greater severity of punishment from high authoritarians and greater leniency from low authoritarians. In this experiment only high and low scoring authoritarians were used in the pool of subjects. This probably helped to reduce variance and produced more clearly defined differences between high and low scoring authoritarians.

In another study Ryckman, Burns, and Robbins (1986) found that high authoritarians relied more heavily on harsher sentencing strategies for severe crimes than did low authoritarian subjects ($p < .05$). They were more apt to rely on deterrence than the low scoring authoritarians. However, it was found that high authoritarian subjects did not differ significantly from low authoritarians in judging low severity offenders. Ryckman et al. stressed the importance of considering situational factors and not merely relying on a theoretical assumption that broad dispositional factors are the only factors that need to be considered when attempting to understand the judging behaviors of authoritarians.

The complexity of understanding the authoritarian mind is further underscored by three studies dealing with authoritarian punitiveness. Siegel and Mitchell (1979) found that high authoritarians were significantly influenced by the perceived moral character of defendants in a simulated jury trial. Female authoritarians were the most punitive to a defendant of high moral character who committed a crime, whereas male authoritarians were more severe towards defendants of reputed low moral character. Both male and female authoritarian jurors expressed greater moral certitude regarding their judgments than their egalitarian counterparts. In another study Berg and Vidmar (1975) found that high authoritarians recall more evidence relating to the character of the defendant as opposed to the low authoritarians who recalled more about situational evidence. As one possible explanation, the authors cited G. Y. Jurow's hypothesis that the authoritarian may be inclined to make a presumption of guilt and thus be apt to focus on the defendant's overt character traits rather than on situational evidence. In a third study, Garcia and Griffitt (1978) found that dispositional-situational interactions are among the important factors to be considered in anticipating the judgments of the authoritarian personality. They found that, to the extent to which the target person's characteristics or behaviors engage the important ideological content of the authoritarian personality, it is a powerful mediator of authoritarian punitiveness. For example, they found that high authoritarians recommended more severe punishments for a defendant accused of incest ($p < .01$) than low authoritarians. However, they did not recommend a significantly more severe punishment for a defendant accused of child abuse in the course of disciplining a disobedient child.

From the above citations of the empirical literature, it appears that the authoritarian personality tends to be more aggressive and that he or she expresses this hostility in ego-syntonic ways by directing hostility and punitiveness outward

to persons or groups which are viewed as different or inferior. (This involves a split of the self and objects which is addressed below.) Authoritarians are more prone to be severely punitive with those who commit severe crimes, are of a perceived lower moral character, do not live up to what the authoritarian expects of them based upon their social standing (especially true for women), and who violate the authoritarian's own rigid set of values. This external focus of hostility, blame, and condemnation is most frequently targeted toward what Adorno et al. called the outgroup. This is the foundation for prejudicial living.

Ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is not so much one of the characteristics of the authoritarian personality as it is the very substance of it (Adorno et al. used the terms authoritarian, ethnocentrist, anti-democratic, and prejudiced somewhat interchangeably). It is included here in order to understand the dynamics of the next point to come under discussion; the preference of hierarchical relationships. However, first the concept of ethnocentrism as it operates in the authoritarian personality requires discussion.

For Adorno et al. (1950), ethnocentrism is conceived as an ideological system pertaining to group relations in which a distinction is made between ingroups and outgroups. The authoritarian personality identifies with the ingroup while possessing no sense of belonging or connection with the outgroup. In fact, the authoritarian personality usually feels quite arrogantly superior to the members of the outgroups. The outgroup is often the object of derogatory opinions and hostile attitudes while supportive attitudes and positive opinions regarding ingroups are uncritically formed and maintained. Adorno et al. found that college sorority members--groups with strong ingroup ideology--were significantly more anti-Semitic than nonmembers.

The authoritarian's need for an outgroup prevents him or her from experiencing a sense of common humanity with others who are viewed as

different. In a study by Heaven and Furnham (1987) it was found that not only did authoritarianism correlate significantly with racial prejudice (the outgroup was dark skinned people in Britain), but it also correlated with a scale that measures denial of poverty. The authoritarian's need for an outgroup disables him or her from learning of others based upon specific experiences with those who are different. This often takes the form of denominationalism, pro-segregation attitudes, nationalism, and even imperialism. The white supremacy movement in America is a radical example of this kind of thinking.

The prejudicial distinction between ingroups and outgroups is viewed by the authoritarian as permanent and unresolvable due, in part, to the fact that the authoritarian believes that fate, heredity, or some other greater power has established the nature of things (see above). Furthermore, the presence of prejudice towards one minority group tends to presage generalized prejudice towards a variety of others because of the lack of rationality underlying the prejudice. The outgroups, according to Adorno et al. (1950), are seen by the authoritarian to be threatening and power-seeking even though they are usually objectively weaker than the ingroups which they supposedly threaten. The outgroup is seen as a threat because the authoritarian perceives it as trying to retaliate for injustices done and capture a superior position vis-à-vis the ingroup. This requires the constant exercise of dominance over the so-called inferior groups. It is easy to see that the authoritarian would tend to relate in a hierarchical fashion --submitting himself or herself to the superior ingroup and attempting to domineer over the outgroup members.

Preference for Hierarchical Relationships. Adorno et al. (1950) construed the mistrust displayed by the typical authoritarian towards outgroups as being the result of the authoritarian's misconception of people--i.e., that people are seeking only power and material benefits at the expense of others. Adorno et al. believed

the conclusion upon which the authoritarian operated was that only the most ruthless will win out in such a competitive world. The authoritarians they studied tended, in fact, to view the world as a jungle and these subjects indicated that they believed the best way to survive was to affiliate with the powerful and influential. Such beliefs suggest a paranoid system at work in the authoritarian personality--an issue which will be addressed later in the paper. At the same time the authoritarians held contempt for the weak in what appears to be a denial and projection of weakness in the authoritarian personality. Thus the authoritarian tended to enter into hierarchical relationships in which there were simultaneously an excessive need for submission to a higher authority and a desire to control and possess weaker partners in relationship. Adorno et al. found a significant difference in this regard ($p < .01$) when authoritarians and nonauthoritarians were compared.

Adorno et al. (1950) also showed from their interview records how preoccupied authoritarian subjects were with social mobility, issues of strong and weak, the bottom and the top, and moving up with the help of the more powerful--essentially agreeing with Erich Fromm's description of the typical authoritarian relationship pattern:

> In authoritarian philosophy the concept of equality does not exist. The authoritarian character may sometimes use the word equality either conventionally or because it suits his purposes. But it has no real meaning or weight for him, since it concerns something outside the reach of his emotional experience. For him the world is composed of people with power and those without it, of superior ones and inferior ones. On the basis of his sado-masochistic strivings, he experiences only domination or submission, but never solidarity. Differences, whether of sex or race, to him are necessarily signs of superiority or inferiority. A difference which does not have this connotation is unthinkable to him. (Fromm, 1969, pp. 195-196)

The recent empirical literature also underscores the authoritarian preference for hierarchical relationships. A previously cited study by Younge and Regan (1978) showed that authoritarian subjects held significantly more traditional expectations

of their future spouse than did egalitarians. These traditional roles were essentially hierarchical in structure. It should be noted that the men held to significantly greater traditional attitudes on two out of five measures than did the women. In a study by Centers, Raven, and Rodrigues (1971) it was found that both husbands and wives with high F scores (i.e., high authoritarians) tended to be found in families in which one spouse was dominant--usually the husband. In families where the wife was dominant, it was found that marital satisfaction tended to be low. In an experiment by Kushell and Newton (1986) it was found that autocratic leaders were perceived more negatively than the democratic leaders--especially among females. It was also found that leadership style, not leadership gender, was the significant determinant of subject satisfaction. These results reinforce the premise of Adorno et al. that authoritarians prefer hierarchical relationships. Yet they also contain data that indicate problems exist with such a rigid relational structure--especially differences which occur between men and women. More will be said about this later in the paper.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Defense Mechanisms

Having examined the characteristics of the authoritarian personality, attention is now turned to the task of understanding the defensive dynamics which operate to rigidly preserve the authoritarian personality structure over time. Four interrelated clusters of psychodynamics, which enable the authoritarian to resist change, will be discussed: (a) the splitting and idealization of self and objects, (b) a process of projective identification with ingroups, (c) the denial and repression of dependency needs, and (d) the process of externalizing aggressive and libidinal need states. There exists far less empirical literature covering this aspect of the authoritarian personality. However, these four clusters of psychodynamics will be suggested as ways of understanding the material already discussed and some of Adorno's relevant data will be brought to bear on the issue.

Splitting and Idealization of Self and Objects. As was discussed above, the authoritarian tended to describe his or her parents in conventional, generalized, and undifferentiated terms. The authoritarians primarily glorified external features of the parents such as physical appearance or behavioral conduct. This distorted manner of describing the parents was characterized be Adorno et al. (1950) as an idealization of the parents. Contrary to the nonauthoritarian subjects, seldom did the authoritarians give an objective appraisal of their parents which included both positive and negative traits. Some spoke in fantastic terms which unrealistically elevated their parents. Some of the authoritarians praised their parents but communicated in a manner in which it appeared that the subject was emotionally detached from what he or she was saying. Some followed up a word of praise with an immediate association which was unconsciously hostile and tended to negate what was said. This type of thinking suggests a split in the authoritarian's internal experience of the parents. In fact, Adorno et al. (1950) used the term "split off" (p. 385) to explicate the authoritarian's apparent loss of integration of real childhood experiences with his or her parents. They described the authoritarian's split off hostility and resentment towards the parents of his or her childhood as ego-alien--evidence of a lack of individuation and ego maturity. Dynamically, it appears that hostility towards the parents is experienced as ego-alien because of a distortion created by an unconscious splitting in which bad affect is expunged from the authoritarian's conscious experience of his or her parents. This allows an authoritarian to internalize or introject the parents in idealized form--thus creating an ego-ideal which is both unattainable and perverse. It is unattainable because it admits no faults or shortcomings. It is perverse because withholding and punitive aspects of the parents are not experienced as bad. Rather, these destructive aspects of the parents are reified as idealized internal objects with whom the authoritarian identifies. This dynamic, when combined with sufficient

innate aggression in the child, forms the basis for the sado-masochistic mind. Adorno et al. (1950) found that male and female authoritarians showed a significantly greater tendency than nonauthoritarians towards anal syndrome behaviors which they associated with the sado-masochistic personality.

Adorno et al. (1950) also reported a strong trend towards ego-alien self-contempt in the authoritarian subjects. This trend was marked by self- glorifying statements (this tendency was discussed at length above) followed by statements of self-contempt which were not recognized as such. Dynamically, it seems that an authoritarian's ego is so overly identified with his or her ego- ideal that there is little room for any thinking which might bring to awareness feelings of self-contempt. Thus self-reflection is not possible regarding such matters and statements indicating self-reproach (probable slips and "just" humor) are uttered without awareness or felt ownership of what was said. This clinical datum indicates a further split--a split of the experience of self.

Evidence reported in the work of Adorno et al. (1950) for the existence of the dynamic of splitting in the authoritarian personality included such findings as: (a) glorifying parents yet demonstrating ego-alien resentment over being victimized in some way as a child (here the split is good parents--bad parents); (b) glorifying parents yet describing oneself as being a difficult child in order to explain destructive ways of relating (here the split is good parents--bad child); and (c) glorifying parents yet expressing marked detachment from childhood experience (here the split is good adult self--bad childhood self). Adorno found evidence of marked discontinuity with childhood exhibited only by the authoritarians at significant levels ($p < .01$ for males and $p < .05$ for females) and little spontaneous comment about childhood compared to the nonauthoritarians (significant for both males and females with $p < .02$).

Projective Identification with Ingroups. With the introjection of the idealized parents, the authoritarian experiences being in possession of a very powerful parental imago with whom he or she completely identifies. The advantages of this complete identification are obvious; it allows the authoritarian to join in the omnipotent power of the ideal parent. The ego so identifies with the ego-ideal that one might say they become fused or merged with no gap or free mental space for independent thought--the possession of which might allow the ego to question and grow. The trade-off amounts to subjugating one's personal needs and growth to an intolerant agency of the mind in exchange for an illusion of omnipotent power and freedom from anxiety. Development and change is highly restricted under this condition.

This internal dynamic of identification with the powerful parental imago is projectively externalized in the authoritarian's relationships with other powerful persons and ingroups in what appears to be an attempt to replicate externally what is an internal reality. This can be seen in what Adorno et al. (1950) found about the nature of the authoritarian family, namely, that authoritarians tended to have an ingroup orientation to the family. They also tended to magnify the status of their families to such a degree that their entire conception of their families was modified. They attempted to give the impression of their families possessing elevated repute and prestige--thus greater social power.

Projective identification with the ingroup is a hallmark of the authoritarian personality and forms a basis for continued omnipotent identification with ideal objects. It also forms a basis for prejudicial living and rigid hierarchical relationships. In a study by Dovidio, Campbell, and Kahn (1982) subjects rated the anticipated success of a confederate on a masculine type of task. While nonauthoritarians showed no tendency towards differential attributions, high authoritarians showed a significant tendency to differentially attribute ability to a

confederate based on sex--the men attributed more skill to males and the women attributed more skill to females. The authoritarian subjects--who appear to have been omnipotently identified with their own sex group--attributed greater power (skill) to the same sex confederates without a rational basis.

In two well designed and creative experiments, the authoritarian personality was again shown to exhibit a positive ingroup bias. Downing and Monaco (1986) found that authoritarian subjects enhanced the ingroup performance of ski class members while they disparaged the outgroup across all three experimental conditions of differential contact. The nonauthoritarians did not show a tendency towards ingroup-outgroup bias. Goldberg and Evenbeck (1976) conducted an experiment using students who were asked to solve anagrams and then rate their own and others' outcomes in terms of internal factors (ability and effort) or external factors (task and luck). Success or failure were experimentally controlled. Goldberg and Evenbeck found that authoritarian subjects were more internal than egalitarian subjects only in the condition of one's own success (self-idealization) and the other's failure (outgroup disdain). Authoritarian observers were more external for other's success (outgroup disdain) and more internal for other's failure (outgroup disdain)--but only when their own outcome was successful. (Otherwise, the identification would be with the disdained outgroup.) The authors concluded that authoritarian personalities exaggerate their own abilities and derogate others' only when they are in a position of superiority vis-à-vis others.

Denial and Repression of Dependency Needs. The compliment of omnipotent identification with ideal internal objects and ingroups is the denial and repression of dependency needs. It was noted above that authoritarianism was found by Heaven and Furnham (1987) to be significantly related to racism and to a scale which measured denial of economic poverty--i.e., the needy state of outgroup members. Denying poverty in the outgroup probably prevented the authoritarian

from being confronted with his or her own need states and thus finding ground for empathy and new understanding of the outgroup. In another study by Jabin (1987) it was shown that authoritarian-aggressive personality traits (i.e., the sadistic component of the authoritarian personality) correlated moderately with attitudes of hostility towards the physically disabled. Authoritarian-submissive traits (i.e., the masochistic component of the authoritarian personality) significantly correlated with attitudes of pity ($p < .01$). From this study one can see that the more sadistic authoritarian rejects outright what is considered weak or "inferior" while the more masochistic authoritarian pseudo-identifies with and patronizes the weak and inferior--probably as a reaction formation to hostile feelings.

Adorno et al. (1950) found that authoritarians did manifest a diffuse sort of ego-alien dependence which was characterized by escapism, weakness, and affective poverty. This form of dependence appears to have been ego-alien because of the dynamic of denial and repression. In authoritarian men dependence was expressed openly only when their defenses were completely overwhelmed. Their typical reaction to such a state of affairs was exemplified by foxhole religion--a form of escapism. Adorno et al. contrasted the above sort of dependence with a dynamic of love oriented succor and nurturance. When authoritarians and nonauthoritarians were compared it was found that the first type of dependence was more common to the authoritarians ($p < .01$). Nonauthoritarians typically exhibited the latter type of dependence.

In their self-evaluations, authoritarians in the study by Adorno et al. (1950) usually stressed their will power and determination in overcoming the handicaps and vicissitudes of life. They tended to repeatedly assert their pseudo-independence, potency, and self-reliance. Deviations from the authoritarians' accepted patterns of conduct were regarded by the authoritarian subjects to be caused by powerful external factors over which the subjects had no control; or they

were considered unexplainable. They seemed to fear loss of self-control (while still being accountable for their behavior), in that, awareness of the possibility that unconscious impulses may be breaking through into overt behavior tended to be denied. These patterns prompted the authors to interpret the authoritarian personality as rigidly defended against strong feelings of dependence, passivity, helplessness, and sometimes even self-contempt.

Adorno et al. (1950) referred to the different role that the defenses of denial and repression play in the two types of personalities:

> In summarizing differences in the personality structure of our two groups, we may best start with the..."defense mechanisms." Regardless of whether the specific topic was that of ambivalence, or aggression, or passivity, or some other related feature of personality dynamics, the outstanding finding was that the extremely unprejudiced individual tends to manifest a greater readiness to become aware of unacceptable tendencies and impulses in himself. The prejudiced individual, on the other hand, is more apt not to face these tendencies openly and thus to fail in integrating them satisfactorily with the conscious image he has of himself. The resultant break between the conscious and the unconscious layers in the personality of the high scorers, as compared with the greater fluidity of transition and of intercommunication between the different personality strata in the low scorers, appears to have the greatest implications for their respective personality patterns. (p. 474)

Externalization of Aggressive and Libidinal Need States. According to Adorno et al. (1950), a primary characteristic of ethnocentric thinking--and therefore common to the authoritarian personality--is the generality of outgroup rejection. While the authoritarian may have strong feelings of enmity towards particular groups, he or she is apt to hold ethnocentric opinions towards many others. If a group is not acceptable--especially in a moralistic sense--it is alien. It is as if the authoritarian feels threatened by groups with which he or she cannot identify. The authoritarian does not acknowledge the sense of threat directly; rather he or she will tend to exhibit a defensive air of superiority over the "inferior" group.

The focus of the ingroup-outgroup distinction will typically shift among various levels of social organization and, depending on the exigencies of the social

situation in which the authoritarian finds himself or herself, hostile attitudes will be directed towards some group or person perceived to be inferior or different. For example, an authoritarian may make an ingroup-outgroup distinction between Americans vs. Arabs; spouting rash and prideful statements to the effect that "all those Arabs in the Persian Gulf aren't worth the life of one American GI." Then, upon viewing a television broadcast regarding war casualties, an irrational shift in distinction can occur as the authoritarian scoffs at the grief of the black community over the loss of one of its sons in the war with such bigoted comments as: "No big loss--it was just a nigger."

This generalized, constantly shifting outgroup distinction offers the authoritarian extensive opportunity to externalize any ego-alien thoughts, feelings, or impulses which originate from within--especially those which are aggressive or of a forbidden sexual nature. For example, ego-alien sexuality was seen to be projected into outgroups in the willingness of the authoritarian to believe that outgroup members commonly engage in sex orgies, that Jews were more sensual than Gentiles, or that Blacks possessed greater sexual prowess than Whites (Adorno et al., 1950). Given the authoritarian's tendency to externalize, it is not surprising that authoritarians were found by Adorno et al. to be anti-intraceptive. Nonauthoritarians displayed a much greater readiness toward intraception than did the authoritarian subjects--significant at the $p < .01$ level. From a psychodynamic perspective, anti-intraceptive tendencies in the authoritarian personality will inevitably tend to prevent the authoritarian from developing a confident individualized identity based upon self-knowledge; and the paranoid system of externalizing taboo impulses into "the enemy" will work against intimacy. It seems that the authoritarian personality's need to constantly seek an external group into which to put ego-alien impulses of an aggressive or sexual nature would also serve to keep the authoritarian defended against the awareness

of any need for personal change--and keep him or her from realizing the need to rely on others (who are different) for help in changing. The authoritarian personality, therefore, appears to be defended against growth itself.

To the extent that the authoritarian wishes to moralistically regulate and punish the sexual behavior of consenting adults, one can see a dynamic of projective identification operating. In this case it appears that the authoritarian may actually be acting on a phantasy that he or she can control, possess, and punish ego-alien parts of self by doing so to the object into which the projection is made. As was noted above, Adorno et al. found that high scorers tended toward a moralistic condemnation of others while low scorers were more permissive towards other people. This difference was significant ($p < .01$).

It should be obvious that none of these four psychodynamic clusters operate independently--especially the dual process of projective identification operating in the ingroup-outgroup distinction. The authoritarian simultaneously identifies with the idealized ingroup while disdaining the villainized outgroup. The reader will recall that Downing and Monaco (1986) found that the authoritarian subjects in their study significantly enhanced their evaluation of the skills of ingroup skiers while depreciating the skills of the outgroup members at the same time. The only distinction between outgroup and ingroup members in this study was the color of the ski bands which the ski instructors required the ski class members to wear. This study highlights the irrational nature of the ingroup-outgroup bias. It is more rooted in a projective phantasy than reality. It should not come as a surprise to the reader that the study by Adorno et al. (1950) found their group of authoritarians distorted reality more than nonauthoritarians--especially social reality. The authors claimed that social reality served as a projection screen for impulses and needs when repression failed. It seems that anyone excessively distorting reality in this manner would also inevitably become very resistant to being changed by it.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Etiological Factors

This section deals with some of the etiological factors which contribute to the development of the authoritarian personality. It is not to be construed as exhaustive. Rather, it highlights some of the factors which will have a bearing on the later sections of this paper. Attention is given to: (a) the general familial factors which contribute to the formation of authoritarianism in both men and women, and then to the particulars of; (b) the development of authoritarian men--with their harsh fathers and sacrificing, submissive mothers, and (c) the development of authoritarian women--with their restrictive mothers and exploited fathers; (d) the authoritarian's lack of differentiation from the parents; and (e) general social and economic factors that play a role in the development of the authoritarian personality.

General Familial Factors. The original families of the highly prejudiced individuals in the study by Adorno et al. (1950) were characterized as: (a) being relatively harsh in parental discipline which was experienced by the child as arbitrary, (b) being clearly defined in terms of roles which were based on a rigid pattern of dominance and submission--usually with the father as the dominant member, (c) maintaining rigid conventional social mores which were infused with anxiety stemming from preoccupation with social status, (d) offering only limited conditional love and affection, and (e) placing an emphasis on materialism. Adorno also found there was a tendency towards a dichotomous conception of the sex roles and relative separation of the sexes within the family--especially in the original families of the male authoritarians.

The original family relationships, described by the high authoritarians in the study of Adorno et al, were intolerant of the child's unique needs and instinctual process. Attitudes and behaviors which conformed to an external set of upwardly mobile social values were imposed on the child--even though the parental value

system was beyond the scope of the child's understanding. Conduct which was not in conformity with the family's social façade was looked upon with disapproval or was actively punished. Hence, the relationship with the parental couple acquired a forbidding and often distant quality for the child--and feelings and behaviors which did not conform to their demands were, of necessity, split off by the child.

It is clear from the descriptions of early authoritarian family relationships cited above, that the scope of experience admissible to the awareness of authoritarian children is restricted--and ego development is thus skewed. The above process inevitably interferes with the development of a clear-cut individual identity resulting in an impoverished relational capacity. The relationships which the authoritarian forms tend to be stylized into conventional roles which are shallow (Adorno et al, 1950). If the above developmental factors are combined with the inevitable social modeling of dominance and submission exhibited within the marital dyad, it is easy to see how the impoverished hierarchical pattern of relating found in the original family may be carried over into the next generational family unit. However, there is a positive note from recent research. A study by Bush, Gallagher III, and Weiner (1982) indicated that college students were significantly less apt to be as authoritarian as their parents. The authors suggested that the lack of parent-offspring correlation may be viewed as an indication of shifting influences in the socialization process--a shift from the parents to other institutions such as the schools, the media, and a distinctive youth subculture.

Particulars in the Development of Authoritarian Men. The typical high scoring male in the sample of subjects studied by Adorno et al. (1950) described the family of origin to be dominated by the father--except for a few instances where the mother was said to be dominant and the father to be henpecked. (In the study by Bush et al. cited above, 48% of the authoritarian men had dominant fathers while 26% had authoritarian mothers.) The fathers from the authoritarian homes were

usually described as being distant, stern disciplinarians with a bad temper, and as maintaining barriers between fathers and sons. The nonauthoritarian sons described their fathers as tending to be warm, friendly, and demonstrative. The difference between the authoritarians and the nonauthoritarians on this score was significant ($p < .05$). The fathers of the nonauthoritarians were also reported to be relaxed and mild. They frequently spent time playing and doing things with their sons.

Generally, authoritarians appeared to come from families ruled by means of domination of some sort--usually the father--while the nonauthoritarians reportedly came from families "ruled" by love from a mother who was not too weak or submissive. The nonauthoritarian typically described the original family to be mother centered with love and nurture predominating. The nonauthoritarian son most frequently described his mother as warm; and half of the low scoring men additionally described her as intellectual and/or aesthetic. This experience of a warm mother seems to be important to the development of the capacity for love. The mother of the authoritarian was most often described by her son as being kind, self-sacrificing, and submissive (Adorno et al, 1950). However, this description can be interpreted as a mother who masochistically allowed herself to be dominated by the husband while she fulfilled the role of a martyr. Due to her difficulty in being assertive, such a mother would not be able to be emotionally present in a pro-active sense for the family--including the children. This is somewhat borne out by the interview records of Adorno et al. which showed that authoritarian men tended to describe their "kind" mother in terms of what material things she gave to them or what she did for them--not in terms of met emotional needs.

It appears that the mothers in the study by Adorno et al. possessed primary influence in regard to the religious preference of the off-spring by providing the

standard against which to react. To a lesser extent than with the daughters, sons who profess the same religion as the mother tend to be more prejudiced (and therefore authoritarian), while those who profess a different faith (or no faith when the mother professes and vice versa) tend to be less prejudiced. There was little statistical relationship between the religious preference of the father vis-à-vis the son and measures of authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950). This finding indicates a degree of individuation is involved in making a profession of faith which is individually chosen and not merely accepted as the conventional thing to do--and it appears that it is usually the religion of the mother which determines which faith is a matter of convention. Because the correlations are not highly significant, it seems that the mother does not represent the central figure of conflict (in regards to authority) to her sons. Rather, it appears that the figure of central conflict involving authority issues may most frequently revolve around the father over matters other than religion. However, the situation is different with the daughters. This is addressed immediately below.

Particulars in the Development of Authoritarian Women. The relationships which authoritarian women typically reported to have with their fathers were characterized by Adorno et al. as being opportunistic and exploitational. The authoritarian women tended to describe the relationships with their fathers in terms of material provision rather than affection. There was little evidence in the interview record of a genuine positive relationship of the women toward their fathers. When the high scorers did express a criticism of the father, the main reproach was of him not providing enough. One aspect which set the female authoritarians apart from the nonauthoritarians was the fact that the nonauthoritarians were more prone to describe their fathers in intellectual or aesthetic terms (Adorno et al, 1950). Bush et al. (1982) found that the authoritarian women in their sample came from families in which only 21% of the fathers were

more authoritarian than the mothers. In 44% of the homes, the mothers were the more dominating parent. The difference in this pattern compared to the male pattern noted above is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

High scoring women typically described their mothers as being overly restrictive. They tended to describe their mothers in ego-alien terms of resentment--often in conjunction with glorification of their mothers. They reported feeling victimized by unfair and restrictive treatment, feeling forgotten, and feeling as though they did not get enough of the things which they deserved (Adorno et al, 1950). In the Thematic Apperception Test results reported by Adorno et al., authoritarian women tended to express a great deal of hostility towards their mothers. The TAT stories revealed the excessive pressures which mothers exerted upon their authoritarian daughters and the preconscious fantasies of revenge which the daughters secretly imagined. While feelings of victimization were also not uncommon with the nonauthoritarian women, their resentments were usually reactions to loss of love rather than dissatisfaction with not getting enough. More low scoring women described their mothers as being demonstratively warm and lovable than did high scoring women (Adorno et al., 1950).

In a pattern more extreme than was the case with the men, a significant correlation was found between measures of prejudice in the daughter and the nature of her religious commitment. The factor which differentiated the high and low scorers, was whether the daughters' faith commitment was different than the mothers' faith commitment. When commitment was made which differed from the mother, assessed prejudice (a measure of authoritarianism) decreased. The lowest prejudice correlated to a rejection of the mother's religion in favor of no faith commitment at all (Adorno et al., 1950). It is probable that if the daughters were able to make a relevant decision regarding their own beliefs, then they had

individuated sufficiently to free themselves from submission to parental control--an important aspect of prejudice and the authoritarian character structure. In the case of authoritarian daughters, the figure of central conflict was shown to be the mother (Adorno et al., 1950).

Lack of Differentiation from the Parents. In a study of parental attitudes towards child rearing practices by Dielman, Barton, and Cattell (1977), it was found that a continuum emerged ranging from a significant correlation of early responsible training of children with the promotion of independence, to an authoritarian parental control pattern which correlated with the promotion of dependency. The former attitude towards child rearing was associated with low inter-spouse hostility and high inter-spouse gregariousness. The authoritarian parental attitude was associated with high inter-spouse hostility and low gregariousness. These findings highlight the problem which authoritarian personalities face growing up in homes in which relationships are often rigidly hierarchical and infused with authoritarian hostility. The offspring of an authoritarian couple face great difficulty in differentiating from their parents. Those who do not differentiate from their parents, often develop an authoritarian personality structure themselves. Examples of this phenomenon taken from the empirical research follow below.

Adorno et al. (1950) found that the offspring of Republicans (the more conservative party) tended to be significantly less ($p < .05$) ethnocentric than the offspring of Democrats (the more liberal party). This is evidence of the fact that the majority of children are able to differentiate from their parents--they don't just incorporate whole everything they are told. Adorno et al. also found that subjects reporting some ideological friction with their parents were significantly less anti-Semitic than those who gave no indication of any such disagreement. It is hypothesized that the ability to benignly criticize the parents is evidence of a degree

of differentiation from the parents. However, implicit in this finding is the fact that not all offspring are able to differentiate themselves to the extent that they have formed their own opinions on issues--and those who do not, tend to exhibit increased authoritarian traits. It will be recalled from the discussion above, that when the mother's religion appears to have been accepted as a matter of convention (or for external reasons), ethnocentrism scores go up--indicating increased submission to authority, increased prejudice, and authoritarian thinking.

As has already been discussed, Adorno et al. (1950) found that high scoring individuals tended to glorify their parents. Related to this phenomenon was the attitude of submission to authority which characterized the authoritarian personalities--especially the males. This trait differentiated the authoritarian men from the nonauthoritarian men ($p < .01$) more highly than it did the authoritarian women from the nonauthoritarian women ($p < .02$). It appears that authoritarian men are faced with a more serious submission problem than are the authoritarian women. This may be due to the finding that high scoring male authoritarians were significantly ($p < .01$) more likely to have been subjected to threats and punishment for violation of parental rules (the experience of which was not apt to be assimilated) than were their low scoring counterparts--perhaps instilling a lifelong fear of transgressing internalized parental authority.

In contrast to the submission to authority which the authoritarians demonstrated, Adorno et al. found that low scoring individuals were more frequently characterized by an attitude of principled independence from the parents--this was especially typical of low scoring men. Furthermore, the nonauthoritarian men were not as likely to be subjected to violent and capricious discipline. According to Adorno et al, the difference between the high and low scoring subjects in regards to the type of discipline, family structure, and the

personality of the parents (stern vs. relaxed) is part of the foundation for an authoritarian vs. democratic approach to interpersonal relationships.

Social and Economic Factors. It is likely that constitutional factors and familial influence are not the only elements which contribute to the formation of the authoritarian personality. Undoubtedly, there are social and economic forces brought to bear upon the development of the authoritarian mental structure. For instance, when economic times are difficult, there is more pressure on the parents to provide for the family, more insecurity, and undoubtedly more of a tendency to resort to a closed ingroup mentality as a way of protecting one's own. This was seen in the radical anti-Semitism of Europe during the most difficult of times between the great wars. During times of economic and social threat there will undoubtedly be more pressure brought to bear upon the children to behave in socially acceptable ways because of diminished emotional capacity in the parents who are already "full of worry." Furthermore, behavior which is socially acceptable to the ingroup counts for more when resources are scarce and the ingroup is in possession of them--so it becomes more important that the children avoid behaving in proscribed ways so as not to alienate others identified with the ingroup.

The impact of threat from economic hard times and social unrest on the development of the authoritarian syndrome was examined in a unique study by Sales (1973). Relying heavily on bibliographic research, he was able to show that operationalized measures of authoritarianism significantly increase during times of high threat (the great depression and the turbulent late sixties) when compared to times of low threat (the prosperous twenties and the peaceful early sixties). Sales' data indicated that environmental threat was reliably associated with a change in behaviors commonly connected with the authoritarian syndrome.

Perceived threat of impending personal failure can also elevate an individual's sense of anxiety and potentially cause a regression into increased authoritarian mechanisms for those who are so prone. Sales and Friend (1973) conducted two experiments in which subjects were exposed to success or threat of failure in completing a task. The outcomes of the tasks were experimentally controlled. In both experiments it was reported that failure significantly increased assessed authoritarianism and success decreased it ($p < .005$). Furthermore, the second experiment showed that the manipulations affected the subjects' tendencies to conform to judgments of the confederate authority figure. The findings cited here show that environmental factors can contribute to both the development and the exacerbation of the authoritarian syndrome. They should be considered as co-contributing factors in the etiology of the authoritarian personality along with the familial dynamics and the child's own constitutional make-up.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Status as Mental Illness

There are some researchers who maintain that authoritarians are definitely not mentally or emotionally disturbed as such--those researchers are in good company. Fromm (1969) pointed out that the sado-masochistic character (i.e., authoritarian personality) is not necessarily neurotic. That depends, according to him, on the tasks which a person has to fulfill in his or her social setting and what patterns of feeling and behavior are considered abnormal in that particular culture. He pointed out that much of the lower-middle class of Germany--and much of Europe--is typically sado-masochistic but is not considered to be neurotic. So, not surprisingly, Duckitt (1983), using a broad based sample of over 700 subjects, found no correlation of authoritarianism with social maladjustment in a carefully designed study.

Ray (1986) showed that assertiveness correlated highly with measures of dominance and authoritarianism--thus concluding that socially disapproved of

authoritarians may be little different than the socially approved people who receive the accolade of being assertive. Ray (1979a) also found in one study that authoritarians did not tend to be neurotic nor dogmatic. Rather he found that they tended to be achievement motivated, unalienated, and internally controlled. He characterized them as solid citizens. However, Ray and Simons (1982) found that when age was controlled as a factor, authoritarian dominance (measured by Ray's Directiveness Scale) was a significant predictor of coronary heart disease.

Heaven and Stones (1979) found that authoritarianism strongly correlated with high self-esteem in their sample of English speaking students (the group of Afrikaans speaking subjects in the study showed no such correlation) and in a later study Heaven (1986) reinforced his findings by showing a highly significant association between high self-esteem and directiveness (a measure of dominance). It should be noted however, that these findings may be the result of highly defended individuals who are quite split off from their feelings and who tend to think positive thoughts as mentioned above.

Even with all of the research cited above in support of the notion that the authoritarian personality syndrome is not a mental illness per se, it seems that one would not want to speak of the psychodynamics of the authoritarian as being healthy. It was mentioned earlier in the paper that Adorno et al. (1950) equivocated on whether the authoritarian personality was a mental illness. Their own research showed that severely disturbed psychiatric subjects showed no significantly higher ethnocentrism. Although their data was inadequate for the purpose of drawing any definite conclusions, it appeared to them that psychiatric subjects who tested in the mid-range of the Ethnocentrism Scale were at least as severely disturbed as the subjects scoring in the high or low range. They also found that no standard diagnostic classifications were able to be correlated with either the high or the low scoring groups--although the members of each group did resemble one another and

were distinct from the opposite group. They found that the distinctive traits which marked the high and low scoring psychiatric groups were no different than the traits that mark undisturbed subjects who score either high or low on the E Scale--however, they were often present in exaggerated form. Adorno et al. concluded that one was as likely to find severe psychiatric disturbance in the middle quartile as in the high or low quartiles. The implication is that the authoritarian personality is not a mental illness. Yet they referred to it as a disease.

Part of the difficulty in answering this difficult question lies in how the medical profession diagnoses a "disease." Bond and Vaillant (1986) found in their study that the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (3rd ed.) (American Psychiatric Association, 1985) could not reliably predict defense mechanisms across different classifications of disorders (except affective disorders) and concluded that diagnosis and defense style are two different dimensions. They suggested a sixth diagnostic axis to provide additional information which could be useful for therapeutic planning. This finding is not surprising in that the DSM-III (American Psychiatric Association, 1985) was constructed as a behaviorally descriptive tool which was atheoretical with regard to etiology or pathophysiological process. This would tend to make it unusable as a tool to differentiate psychodynamic processes. This is also why it is difficult to make a "diagnosis" of the authoritarian personality in terms of discrete classifications of mental illness.

## Authoritarian Personality and Marriage: Research Integration

The next major section of this paper attempts to integrate the findings already discussed regarding the authoritarian personality with empirical research which focuses more specifically on the issue of the authoritarian personality and marriage. The theoretical perspective which guides the integration is

psychoanalytic--drawing heavily on the British school of thought. An attempt to understand how an authoritarian relates to his or her spouse involves examining the paranoid/schizoid dynamics which seem to characterize the authoritarian. Then, attention is turned to the power orientation--as opposed to a love orientation--which the authoritarian personality tends to assume in relationships. Finally, this major section discusses the cycle of privation which seems to hold the authoritarian in unfulfilling relationships. First, attention is turned to an elucidation of the paranoid/schizoid dynamics of the authoritarian personality and the implications which can be drawn about the authoritarian marital relationship.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Paranoid/Schizoid Dynamics

Melanie Klein (1975) described two "positions" which helps to elucidate specific configurations of object relations, anxieties, and defenses which are commonly seen in personality development. The term "positions" should be understood as denoting a combined sense of developmental phases and of dynamic states of mind which persist throughout life. The first of these positions is called the paranoid/schizoid position. It is the more primitive state of mind. The second, more mature position is called the depressive position. In this section of the paper, it is shown that the authoritarian personality tends to function from the paranoid/schizoid position. Attention is given to: (a) the basic dynamics of Klein's paranoid/schizoid position; (b) the schizoid features of the authoritarian personality; (c) the paranoid features of the authoritarian personality; (d) the resulting ego immaturity of the authoritarian; and finally, (e) the paranoid/schizoid dynamics likely to be manifest in authoritarian marriages.

Klein's Paranoid/Schizoid Position. The paranoid/schizoid position is characterized by two primary mental phenomena: (a) the threat of paranoid anxiety (the chief of which is annihilation of the ego-ideal and the self), and (b) an internal state in which the self and objects are split ("schizoid" means split). Hence

comes the name paranoid/schizoid position. The basic defense against paranoid anxiety in this position is a dynamic called projective identification. With the operation of projective identification, the individual seeks in concrete, omnipotent phantasy to project the bad aspects of the self into an external object and introject good objects from outside into the self. By phantasying the projection of bad objects, the self experiences being evacuated of them and thus feels protected from imagined internal persecutory attacks. However, excessive use of this form of defense against persecutory anxiety can leave the self feeling depleted of its substance. Projective identification can also be used to project the good objects, which comprise the core of the ego, in order to keep them safe from bad internal objects; but again, this can deplete the internal resources available to the self and disorganize the ego (Segal, 1974).

There can be a number of aims which the mechanism of projective identification seeks to realize. The most important of these would include the following: (a) the avoidance of awareness of separation from and loss of the ideal object, (b) to gain control of a threatening bad object, (c) to rid the self of bad objects, (d) to attack and destroy a hated object, (e) to protect good parts of the self from danger of attack or separation, and (f) to improve or repair an external object (Segal, 1974).

Splitting of the self and its objects is a mechanism which is closely linked with projective identification. By splitting the self, the ideal objects which comprise the good self (especially the ego-ideal) are removed from the bad self and thus protected from the bad objects contained within it. Objects are also split. For instance, the experience of the parent can be split in such a way that it seems that there are two parents--a bad parent and a good parent--rather than one parent who is at times gratifying (therefore good) and at times frustrating (and therefore bad). This ability to split into "good and bad" lays a foundation for the future faculty of

discrimination and is therefore an important achievement to master in the paranoid/schizoid position. It also is a forerunner of the more sophisticated defense of repression. However, if splitting occurs to a degree which is excessive, and thus impedes normal development, later powers of discrimination will be faulty and the defenses of denial and repression will likely take a very rigid form (Segal, 1974).

Splitting is also related to omnipotent denial in regards to the idealization of the ideal object. Not only does splitting of the object and self help to keep the ideal object far from potentially harmful contact with bad persecuting objects, but denial can also ever increasingly idealize the object because it operates with magically omnipotent powers in the paranoid/schizoid position. Denial can also serve to magically annihilate persecuting objects so as to eliminate paranoid anxiety (Segal, 1974). This state of mind would be unable to experience signal anxiety--a form of ego anxiety which serves to signify that an increase in unpleasure is pending (Hinsie & Campbell, 1975). According to Blanck and Blanck (1979), signal anxiety is a necessary organizational component of the mature (i.e., structured) ego which allows for the capacity for higher order defenses such as repression.

Omnipotent denial also plays a role in magically idealizing persecutory objects. When persecutory objects become idealized, the stage is set for perversity to enter into the individual's interpersonal relationships. The possibility also exists for the ego to identify with this pseudo-ideal object--so that the ego fuses with the ego-ideal. Denial which omnipotently idealizes good objects and magically annihilates persecuting objects (or even idealizes and identifies with them) presages severe difficulties in exercising proper judgment and fine discriminations in adult life (Segal, 1974). These cognitive skills are also important components of the mature ego.

It may be apparent from earlier citations of the research that the authoritarian personality exhibits numerous traits which were mentioned as common to the paranoid/schizoid position. However, a concise summation of these characteristics may help integrate the evidence which is scattered throughout the lengthy discussion above.

The Schizoid Features of the Authoritarian Personality. It will be recalled that the authoritarian personality tends towards extreme idealization of the self and ideal object. The bad aspects of the authoritarian's object are split off and denied, allowing the resultant "all good" object to be internalized. The self is also split in a maneuver designed to protect the idealized object from bad internal objects contained in the self. The authoritarian's instinctual impulses, sensual appetites, common human neediness, and polar opposite sexual identifications are all typically split from awareness or denied as ego-alien weaknesses. The result can be an attitude of arrogant superiority, avoidance of ambiguity and ambivalence (especially in relationships), black and white thinking, inadequate powers of discrimination, a lack of integrative creativity, and difficulty in learning--due, in part, to the compartmentalization of the authoritarian's mind. Often, the ego-ideal, which evolves from this process, becomes the primary object of ego identification so that the self-experience is, in effect, quite severely detached from the true nature of the authoritarian's interpersonal relationships as well as his or her own instinctual world.

This process of denial and schizoid splitting was elucidated in a study by Edward Fischer (1973) in which authoritarian subjects were found to be significantly different than nonauthoritarians on a measure of the ability to hold attitudes which, upon logical consideration, are contradictory. Scoring high on the dispersion index of Fischer's study implied that the subject was more inconsistent and therefore rigidly "walled off" within his or her own mind. The authoritarians

were significantly more inconsistent in their attitude scores (and thus had higher dispersion indices) than nonauthoritarian subjects. Nonauthoritarians were much more consistently humanitarian in their attitudes. This was shown using two different measures of authoritarianism--The Dogmatism Scale (D Scale) and the Fascism Scale (F Scale).

The Paranoid Features of the Authoritarian Personality. Consistent with the paranoid/schizoid position is the paranoid system under which the authoritarian personality frequently operates. It has been discussed above how the authoritarian tends to projectively identify with various outgroups who, to him or her, epitomize the worst of all possible personal and moral characteristics (which, of course, have been split off of the authoritarian's own self). The identification takes the form of irrational fears that the outgroups will somehow seek to "take over" and corrupt the innocent, take revenge for injustices committed against them, or seek to subjugate the ingroup of the authoritarian. Dynamically, this can be seen as a paranoid reaction created when bad parts of the self are split off and put into external objects--which are, in turn, experienced as externalized, but returning in vengeance. Now the authoritarian imperative is experienced to be: control and punish the external objects as the evil embodiment of the bad parts. This is, at least in part, the genesis of authoritarian extrapunitiveness and moralistic hostility discussed previously.

It was also previously discussed how the authoritarian projectively identifies with the ingroup as a means of garnering from its phantasied strength and power. This may help to compensate the authoritarian for the felt drain of his or her inner substance--perhaps seen in the authoritarian's ego-alien self-contempt or lack of true self-confidence--which occurs from an excessive use of projective identification and splitting. This is significant to the authoritarian in that authoritarian personalities commonly view the world as a jungle and often seek to

get ahead by identifying with the strong--another aspect of the paranoid system. The ties that bind the authoritarian with the ingroup are maintained by the authoritarian assuming conservative attitudes and conforming behaviors vis-à-vis the ingroup ideology.

Meissner (1991) noted how closely the characteristics of overtly paranoid individuals approximate the attributes of the authoritarian. These include: (a) conventional religious beliefs; (b) middle class values; (c) submissive and uncritical attitudes towards powerful and idealized authority figures within their reference group; (d) harsh judgmental attitudes towards those whose behavior places them outside of the behavioral parameters set by the reference group; (e) superstitious beliefs; (f) stereotypical thinking and (g) preoccupation with issues of control, dominance vs. submission, and strength vs. weakness. Paranoids also idealize and identify with the powerful and influential in their ingroup, easily develop an "us vs. them" orientation with anyone who disagrees with their dogma, and tend to be easily engaged in disputes over ideology. The reason for the close approximation between the paranoid personality and the authoritarian personality lies in the paranoid processes of the authoritarian personality.

The Ego Immaturity of the Authoritarian Personality. The concurrence of many of the characteristics identifying the authoritarian personality with the dynamics associated with the paranoid/schizoid position suggests that the authoritarian personality functions much of the time from this position--a more immature position than Klein's depressive position. It was also suggested in an empirical study quoted earlier (Lindgren, 1974) that the authoritarian personality may be associated with a low degree of social maturity--insinuating inadequate ego development. Adorno et al. (1950) found, indeed, that authoritarian personalities were differentiated from nonauthoritarians by a category of interview items which assessed ego strength. They described the strong or mature ego to have more

capacity for sustained effort, more ability to postpone pleasure for the sake of internalized values, more ability to assume responsibility, and more emotional maturity than the immature or weak ego. Authoritarians tended to be evaluated as possessing weak egos significantly more frequently ($p < .05$) than the nonauthoritarians. The nonauthoritarians were found to be more prone to possess an ego of moderate or great strength. However, it was also recognized that the subjects who manifested authoritarian personalities commonly displayed a certain type of ego strength that was connected with the tenacious pursuit of success.

The question of ego development in authoritarian personalities was taken up by Loevinger (1976). She recounted how her research into the problems of family life, based entirely on studies of women, revealed the existence of a very robust general factor which she labeled the Authoritarian Family Ideology (AFI). She described a woman manifesting this syndrome as having:

> a punitive and controlling attitude towards many areas of child rearing; she has little ability to conceptualize the child's inner life; and she has a view of family life at once hierarchical and sentimental. . . . She has a rigidly conventional conception of woman's social role; some mistrust of other people and corresponding anxiety; an orderly, scheduled approach to daily life; and perhaps a somewhat [unfavorable] view of woman's biological functions. (Loevinger, 1976, p. 226)

AFI was shown to correlate highly with a test of punitiveness-permissiveness and AFI was shown to significantly decrease in women as they grew older, had more children, and received more education (with the factor of age held constant over the previous two factors). The implication was that AFI decreased as women in her studies had experiences which promoted maturity. It was speculated by Loevinger and her colleagues that the authoritarian personality would score close to the mid-point on her descriptive schemata of ego development based upon developmental milestones--about at the conformist stage of ego development (see table 1).

Table 1. Some Milestones of Ego Development

| *Stage* | *Impulse Control, Character Development* | *Interpersonal Style* | *Conscious Preoccupations* | *Cognitive Style* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Presocial | | Autistic | | |
| Symbiotic | | Symbiotic | Self vs. non-self | |
| Impulsive | Impulsive, fear of retaliation | Receiving, dependent, exploitative | Bodily feelings, especially sexual and aggressive | Stereotyping, conceptual confusion |
| Self-Protective | Fear of being caught, externalizing blame, opportunistic | Wary, manipulative, exploitative | Self-protection, trouble, wishes, things, advantage, control | |
| Conformist | Conformity to external rules, shame, guilt for breaking rules | Belonging, superficial niceness | Appearance, social acceptability, banal feelings, behavior | Conceptual simplicity, stereotypes, cliches |
| Conscientious-Conformist | Differentiation of norms, goals | Aware of self in relation to group, helping | Adjustment, problems, reasons, opportunities (vague) | Multiplicity |
| Conscientious | Self-evaluated standards, self-criticism, guilt for consequences, long-term goals and ideals | Intensive, responsible, mutual, concern for communication | Differentiated feelings, motives for behavior, self-respect, achievements, traits, expression | Conceptual complexity, idea of patterning |
| Individualistic | *Add:* Respect for individuality | *Add:* Dependence as an emotional problem | *Add:* Development, social problems, differentiation of inner life from outer | *Add:* Distinction of process and outcome |
| Autonomous | *Add:* Coping with conflicting inner needs, toleration | *Add:* Respect for autonomy, interdependence | Vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological and psychological, psychological causation of behavior, role conception, self-fulfillment, self in social context | Increased conceptual complexity, complex patterns, toleration for ambiguity, broad scope, objectivity |
| Integrated | *Add:* Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable | *Add:* Cherishing of individuality | *Add:* Identity | |

NOTE: "*Add*" means in addition to the description applying to the previous level.

Note. From Ego Development (pp. 24-25) by J. Loevinger, 1976, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Copyright transferred to author. Adapted and reprinted by permission.

This issue was researched by Deborah Browning (1983) in a study of 966 late adolescents and young adults. It was found that conscientious (higher stage) subjects were consistently less authoritarian than conformist subjects on a variety of attitudes assessed. It was also found that both self-protective subjects (lower stage) and conformists (middle stage) demonstrated a significant degree of authoritarian attitudes but these two groups differed in the extent of their authoritarianism depending on the specific topics being assessed. It was noted by both Loevinger and Browning that the development of the authoritarian syndrome is an important milestone relatively early in the process of ego development--it moves the individual out of the stages ruled by impulse. However, the results of their respective works also indicate that the individual tends to grow out of the authoritarian syndrome as maturity proceeds. So, it appears that the adult authoritarian personality has had some arrest of ego development resulting in a measure of ego immaturity--consistent with the view that the authoritarian personality functions primarily from the paranoid/schizoid position.

Paranoid/Schizoid Dynamics in the Authoritarian Marriage. It can be expected that the authoritarian personality would forge a marital relationship which, in some ways, would be considered immature--not in the sense of acting childish, but in the sense of replicating, with the spouse, early child-like dynamics which have never been resolved in the course of growing up. Further, one can expect that these dynamics would be most clearly seen in the marital dyad when, perhaps, they are not so obvious in other relationships. For it normally falls upon the spouse to be the primary object of dependency in adulthood. Dicks (1967) wrote, "Failure of the need to have one's personality and its tacit assumption of values affirmed and complemented by another . . . can activate regressive defensive movement . . . but only in relation to one object" (p. 314). He stated further,

"In the limited arena of the marital conflict, the spouses can manifest clinically and interchangeably gross hysteric, depressive, paranoid or aggressive behaviour disorders which are not conspicuous in their extra-marital lives" (p. 315).

The marriage relationship inevitably confronts an individual with his or her dependency upon the spouse and thus, with a sense of individual helplessness--but the authoritarian personality may find that it produces intolerable feelings stemming from a re-creation of an undifferentiated relationship of dependency upon the parents. For instance, frightening separations and the possibility of object loss may confront the authoritarian whenever the spouse is indisposed due to illness, is away traveling, or is juggling conflicting demands made upon personal time. Furthermore, anger or rage may not be uncommon reactions to being deprived of time and attention from the spouse--with concomitant unconscious phantasies of retaliation (followed by guilt). Jealousy of others who demand the attention of the spouse (such as children, employment, or friends) can also arise. In other words, an involved marriage relationship would naturally bring about a forward developmental thrust to move the authoritarian into the depressive position--with its attendant angry reactions, guilt, and depressive anxieties. But the need of the authoritarian to avoid any awareness of depressive anxieties gives rise to his or her distinctive patterns of manic defense.

Hanna Segal (1974) talks about a triad of feelings which commonly form a manic defense against the awareness of depressive anxiety and guilt. The manic defenses are complex forms of defense which often operate utilizing various combinations of the defense mechanisms discussed above--such as splitting, projective identification, idealization, and denial. The manic forms of defense which Segal described are: (a) control, (b) triumph, and (c) contempt.

Control is a way of denying dependence upon the object while still compelling him or her to fulfill a need for it. For instance, the male authoritarian might

expound at length upon his ability to provide everything his family needs--while requiring his wife to assume the role of homemaker under the pretense of protecting the woman from having to work in the business "jungle." But the real reason may be that he needs her available to serve him whenever he feels the need for her provision.

Triumph is an omnipotent denial of the depressive feelings of caring and valuing. It can seek to defeat the object which serves (or so it seems) to make the authoritarian feel weak and needy. For instance, an authoritarian may rely heavily on the good graces of a corporate mentor (a member of the ingroup) to get ahead in his or her career--and then feel victorious when able to surpass the mentor (now perceived as a subordinate outgroup member) and cut him or her out of the company. This type of triumph can be especially destructive if it is motivated by excessive envy, as the example shows. Triumph can also take the form of conquering depressive feelings directly by simply keeping at bay such emotions as longing for, or pining after, the love object.

Finally, contempt is a denial of the value of the object itself as a defense against the experience of loss and guilt. An object which is despised is felt to be an appropriate object of envious attack and is not worthy of any subsequent feelings of guilt. This is commonly seen when the character of a spouse is viciously maligned by the former mate when the relationship is in the process of breaking up.

The authoritarian personality will be likely to forge a relationship which is characterized by rigid paranoid/schizoid defenses--often of the manic type--against any movement into an interdependent experience with the spouse. An experience of interdependence would be one in which each spouse is able to utilize the other to explore primary needs and find a tolerable degree of mutual satisfaction. Dicks (1967) described such interdependence in this way:

> Marital interaction, in order to fulfil the desiderata of mutual need satisfaction, requires a flexible readiness in each partner to change their role behaviour in response to the other's need of the moment. One may have to be the leader and the comforter of the other's weakness and dependence at one moment. The next moment the roles will be reversed. The erstwhile leader can now comfortably accept the other's ascendancy and one's own dependence on the partner without loss of self-respect or security. The same need for flexibility could also be demonstrated as applying to aggressive and to sexual needs: to tolerate and respond appropriately to the partner's varying moods for activity, passivity, a quarrel or a tender reconciliation. This flexibility is, of course, an aspect of the capacity to tolerate, fuse and use ambivalence--perhaps the key to the secret of all human relations. It is the ability to "contain hate in a framework of love." (p. 31)

Because of the authoritarian's tendency to defend against dependency needs (and other aspects of the depressive position) one would not expect to find that authoritarian relationships are normally marked by mutuality or the type of interdependence described above. Rather, a highly controlled and rigidly structured relationship, which is hierarchical in nature, would be anticipated. Such a structured relationship would seemingly provide several things. First, it would provide an externalization of the type of internal schizoid splitting in which the authoritarian typically engages--thus recreating in his or her interpersonal world a comfortably familiar form of object relations. Secondly, the rigidity of the marital relationship may appear to immunize the relationship from unexpected intrusions of primary process and role conflicts. However, this would be deceiving in that the hierarchical relationship would also provide an uneven tilt between the spouses reminiscent of the unequal and envy-provoking early child-parent relationship. Thus, the marital relationship which is marked by authoritarian dominance would set the stage for very powerful projective identifications--especially of the paranoid type.

It has been suggested that the authoritarian personality functions in ways which are consistent with Klein's paranoid/schizoid position. Authoritarians appear likely to relate in an immature fashion, eschewing attempts at developing a more meaningful depth oriented relationship out of a need to defend against

interdependency and the feelings which would arise from it--depressive anxiety, helplessness, fear of loss, anger towards the object of need, and guilt. Often, the defense against a dependent relationship will mean relating in ways marred by attempts to control the object, triumph over the object, and hold contempt for the love object. The authoritarian personality was suggested as being more likely to enter into a rigidly controlled hierarchical relationship which mirrors the kind of schizoid splitting of objects that typifies the authoritarian's inner world and which sets up an uneven power relationship--eliciting primitive projective identifications of a paranoid nature. Now, attention will be turned to the empirical research which bears upon the hierarchical nature of the authoritarian marriage--one which is oriented more to the paranoid/schizoid use of power rather than to an orientation of mature love for the object.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Power vs. Love Orientation

This section will address the power orientation which the authoritarian assumes in his or her martial relations. Attention is focused on: (a) the rigid, hierarchical structure of the power-based authoritarian marriage relationship; (b) the empirical literature which addresses marital satisfaction in traditionally structured marriages; and (c) the authoritarian's identification with external authority which serves to bolster the traditionalist marital ideology of the authoritarian.

Hierarchy in the Power-Based Authoritarian Marriage. It was reported above that Adorno et al. (1950) found both male and female authoritarians tended to conceptualize their interpersonal relations in hierarchical, rather than egalitarian, terms. The nonauthoritarian subjects in their study reportedly conceived of relationships in terms of equalitarian mutuality. The difference between the groups was significant ($p < .01$). The high scoring subjects tended to be concerned with issues of differential power within relationships. This can be apprehended in

the terminology which they used to describe those concerns. They talked of the strong and the weak, the bottom and the top, moving upwards, and they seemed very preoccupied with striving for success. Friendship was conceived as a means of getting things rather than a relationship grounded in a mutual giving and taking. This represents a devaluation of the object which Segal (1974) described as an aspect of the manic defenses. Adorno et al described this sort of dependence upon people for things as a diffuse sort of ego-alien dependence and contrasted it with a focal, love seeking succorance. The difference between the high and low scoring groups was significant ($p < .01$ for the men and $p < .05$ for the women). Authoritarian personalities appear to have difficulty in forming relationships based upon a mature love. Rather, they have a tendency to orient themselves towards others on the basis of power and manic control.

Craddock (1977) studied engaged couples and determined that high authoritarian men clearly expressed a preference for a traditional view of marital power--i.e., husband dominant. (Both male and female low authoritarian groups showed a significant difference with a preference for an egalitarian marital relationship.) Furthermore, it was shown that the male traditionalists devalued "female" instrumental values while the traditional women highly valued them--things like housecleaning, cooking, child care, and encouraging responsibility and understanding. This may be one of the reasons that only half of the high authoritarian women expressed a preference for a traditionalist view of marital power. The authoritarian men tend to hold in contempt the very things their wives do for them and upon which they depend--a probable manic form of defense. Perhaps the reluctant half of the female authoritarian group sensed the sadistic component in their sado-masochistic spouses-to-be (or their own split off sadism which they projected into their future mates).

Erich Fromm (1964) described the essence of sadism as being the drive to have control over another living being--not the infliction of pain. He said:

> All the different forms of sadism which we can observe go back to one essential impulse, namely, to have complete mastery over another person, to make of him a helpless object of our will, to become his god, to do with him as one pleases.... Another way of formulating the same thought is to say that the aim of sadism is to transform a man into a thing, something animate into something inanimate, since by complete and absolute control the living loses one essential quality of life--freedom. (p. 32)

Elsewhere, Fromm differentiated the sadistic character from the destructive person. He said:

> The sadist wants to become the master of life, and hence the quality of life should be maintained in his victim. This is, in fact, what distinguishes him from the destroying person. The destroyer wants to do away with a person, to eliminate him, to destroy life itself; the sadist wants the sensation of controlling and choking life. (Fromm, 1973, p. 325)

Fromm (1969) contrasted two different kinds of authority when describing the controlling and choking dynamics of the sado-masochistic or authoritarian character --that of the authority which a slave owner wields over a slave and the authority which a teacher has over the student. The hierarchy involved in the slave owner vs. slave relationship is antagonistic, the interests are at cross purposes, and it establishes a basis for exploitation and paranoia. Its emphasis is on rigid unilateral control from above. On the other hand, the teacher-student relationship is love based and serves to elevate the student to the level of the teacher and beyond. The teacher is identified with the student (i.e., their interests lie in the same direction) and shares in his or her success. Thus, it is a benevolent relationship whose hierarchical distinctions dissolve over time. Fromm spoke of what it means to be engaged in a love-based relationship and it contrasts boldly with the power-based relationship of the authoritarian personality. He stated:

> Love is the productive form of relatedness to others and of oneself. It implies responsibility, care, respect and knowledge, and the wish for the other person to grow and develop. It is the expression of intimacy between two human

> beings under the condition of the preservation of each other's integrity. (Fromm, 1947, p. 110)

These insights offered by Fromm suggest that, to the extent authoritarian marriages are dominated by a sadistic need for power and control, growth within the marital bonds will tend to be thwarted. A hint of this may be seen in the hesitance of authoritarian women to endorse a preference for traditional marital relationships with their fiances. It seems that a flexible love-based relationship which demands a minimum level of control will most likely result in a satisfying relationship marked by growth.

Marital Satisfaction in the Authoritarian Marriage. This section of the paper is fraught with some difficulties because research in the area of marital satisfaction and marital power is very inconsistent. Not all measures of marital power assess authoritarian types of dominance. Not all measures of marital satisfaction are reliable due to the effect of social desirability on many self-report measures used to assess satisfaction. In addition, traditional marriages are not all dyads of authoritarians--but most authoritarians do seem to enter into traditional marriages. A review of the literature in Gottman (1979) offered a further critique of the research:

> The role investigators have proposed for dominance is by no means unambiguous. In fact, some theorists have argued that the lack of a clearly defined power structure is characteristic of distressed families, and other theorists have proposed the opposite position. Unfortunately, research evidence is equally ambiguous. Some researchers have suggested and have found evidence that normal families are equalitarian ... whereas other investigators have suggested and have found evidence that normal functioning implies a clear power hierarchy. (Gottman, 1979, p. 68)

The problems encountered in trying to integrate this body of scientific literature are great, but it is possible to get an overall sense of what the researchers have found. With this caveat, attention will be focused on what can be gleaned from the empirical studies on marital satisfaction in the authoritarian marriage.

In an exhaustive landmark study of Detroit area families, Blood and Wolfe (1960) reported finding that marriages which were characterized by a syncratic decision-making style also tended to report the most marital satisfaction. Syncratic marriages were defined as marriages in which both spouses are actively "counted in" on decisions--an equivalent concept to "egalitarian marriages." At the opposite extreme were families who were ruled by a dominant wife. The two scores, which clustered in the mid-range of marital satisfaction, were the autonomic (each spouse does his or her own thing) and the families ruled by a dominant husband. This comprehensive study served to catapult the study of marital satisfaction into the forefront of empirical investigation and raised the issue of traditional vs. egalitarian marriage vis-à-vis marital quality to the attention of many researchers--including those that follow below.

In a laboratory study of marital power and marital happiness by Kolb and Straus (1974), it was reported that high marital happiness significantly correlated with high power in the husband. Low power in the husband predicted low marital happiness. It was hypothesized that, since low power in the husband was found to be associated with low problem-solving abilities, part of the low happiness ratings reflected a dissatisfaction with his incompetence. The other interesting finding reported by Kolb and Straus was the lack of any significant correlation of marital satisfaction with the marital power of the wife (high or low). However, a confounding influence may be the fact that the measure used to assess marital satisfaction was based upon a report by one of the adolescent children of the couple being studied. The adolescent may not have been sufficiently individuated to be able to "criticize" the family if the mother is somehow at fault--thus marital dissatisfaction may have been denied.

In a study by Pursell, Banikiotes, and Sebastian (1981), it was found that androgynous undergraduates showed a significant preference for egalitarian

marriage, while students who identified with a more traditional sexual role did not show any significant preference for traditional marriage over an egalitarian union. A further finding showed that androgynous students held a preference for an androgynous spouse when asked about their ideal mate. The traditional students also showed a preference for an androgynous spouse--but their preference of a mate contained less androgyny than that of the androgynous students. One interesting note should be made in view of the Craddock (1977) study mentioned in the previous section. The traditional women tended to want androgynous husbands while the traditional men wanted stereotypically traditional wives. The difference between their choices was statistically significant. Again, as a group, the male traditionalists tend to be more favorable to the idea of forming a traditional marriage (husband dominant) than are traditional women.

Similar results as those cited above were obtained in a study of 108 married couples by Antill, Cotton, and Tindale (1983). It was discovered that the husbands' egalitarianism correlated with marital happiness for their wives, but when husbands held a traditional view of marriage, the wives' egalitarianism was associated with less marital happiness for their husbands. In a related study, Bowen and Orthner (1983) found that marriages which had the lowest evaluation of marital quality were those with a traditional husband and a "modern" wife. Again, the above disparity in marital satisfaction and marital quality seems to have been split along sexual lines in a manner similar to Craddock (1977) and Pursell et al. (1981).

In a study of low income families by Osmond and Martin (1978), it was found that the "mode of decision-making" and the "strategy of conflict resolution" emerged as significant predictor variables of marital intactness. These two variables were used to delineate four major styles of family leadership: (a) autocratic, (b) semi-autocratic, (c) semi-democratic, and (d) democratic. It was

found that democratic (or egalitarian) decision-making was the single most important variable for explaining marital intactness. Second, it was found that democratic means of conflict resolution were associated with marital intactness. Both of these democratic variables showed a strong linear relationship with marital intactness. This would appear to support the above mentioned findings of Blood and Wolfe (1960) that suggested increased marital satisfaction is associated with a syncratic marital union.

Sprenkle and Olson (1978) conducted an experiment which utilized Olson's Circumplex Model of Marital Systems to study the differences in the interactions of 25 clinic couples (who were receiving marriage counseling) and 25 control couples (who were not receiving counseling) while completing an experimentally assigned task. It was found that the better adjusted couples had significantly more egalitarian leadership patterns than the clinic couples. The non-clinic couples were significantly more creative, supportive, and responsive to each other's attempts to assert influence than were the clinic couples.

Marie LaLiberte Richmond (1976) found that in the families of recent Cuban immigrants the wife's contribution of resources to the family was not as important in determining the outcome of family interchange as were the joint effects of the dyadic resources and the adherence of the couple to an egalitarian ideology. Broderick and O'Leary (1986) also found that an exchange orientation (a type of egalitarian ideology) was significantly associated with marital satisfaction ($p < .001$). In addition, they discovered that measures of positive feelings toward the spouse and commitment were also significantly correlated with martial satisfaction ($p < .001$). This is another finding which shows support for the efficacy of a relationship based upon a mutual sharing of the leadership functions based upon an abiding love and respect.

There seemed to be a somewhat different picture which appeared in studies of black families. Blood and Wolfe (1960) found that black husbands tended to have less marital power compared to husbands in Caucasian families. They indicated that black families tended to be matriarchal. They further reported that marriages in which the wife is dominant report the least marital satisfaction. These findings were also corroborated by Centers, Raven and Rodrigues (1971) quoted earlier. In an interesting follow-up study, Gray-Little (1982) found an assessment of 75 black couples revealed that those couples in which the husband was dominant frequently reported the highest marital quality. A balanced marital power pattern was also predictive of good marital quality. Consistent with the findings above, Gray-Little reported that those couples in which the wife was the dominant spouse showed the poorest marital quality--but she did not obtain solid evidence that black families were primarily matriarchal. It remains a possibility, however, that black couples as a group may present a different profile of marital interaction (compared to the general population) due to cultural differences.

Finally, two literature reviews flesh out the sampling of specific studies above. The first is by Mirowsky and Ross (1986). The review sought to elucidate social patterns of distress. The authors found that distress (malaise, anxiety, and depression) is reported in the research to be reduced by control, commitment, support, meaning, normality, flexibility, trust, and equity. They reported that sociological theory suggests alienation, inequity, and authoritarianism produce stress. Two factors which were reported as particularly distressful aspects of authoritarianism were (a) inflexibility in dealing with practical and interpersonal problems, and (b) suspiciousness and mistrust.

The second review studied marital quality and stability. It led the authors, Burr, Hill, Nye, and Reiss (1979), to state that "The more the emotional gratification between the spouses, the more the marital quality" (p. 282). Aspects of emotional

gratification which the literature correlated with marital quality and stability were listed as: (a) greater expressions of affection, (b) increased respect between the spouses, (c) greater social-emotional performances, (d) more encouragement towards personal growth, (e) greater equalitarianism, (f) better maintenance of boundaries, (g) greater emotional interdependence, (h) increased love between spouses, (i) more sexual satisfaction, (j) greater congruence between the ideal spouse and one's actual view of the spouse, and (k) increased mutual identification as a couple.

While the above sampling of the research does not pretend to be exhaustive, it does provide a sense of what the literature reports regarding marital satisfaction as it pertains to the topic of this paper. It seems to be common for the research to report highest marital satisfaction in those marriages which are either egalitarian or traditional (with husband dominant). The pattern in which the marriage is dominated by the wife is unambiguously related to the poorest marital quality and low satisfaction. Overall, it appears that the theorists and researchers tend to give greater weight to the contribution of egalitarian relationships in promoting satisfying marriages and individual growth within the marital dyad. In those studies which specifically assess the correlation of authoritarian personality style with marital quality, the results seem to more clearly indicate the desirability of mutually shared leadership roles.

It is instructive to note that when only women are assessed, there seems to be a trend away from the preference for a traditional husband. This is true even if the sample of women is taken from the authoritarian population. It is possible that it is not the idea of a traditional marriage per se which causes women to equivocate in their embracing of a traditional family structure, but their ambivalence in marrying a rigid, domineering man. It seems that few women want to marry an authoritarian man. Even in submissive, authoritarian women who end up

marrying domineering, authoritarian men due to unconscious factors affecting their mate choice, their conscious choice of an ideal mate may not necessarily be a traditional one, due to the fact that their ambivalence towards men is denied.

Identification with External Authority. It has already been noted that the authoritarian is typified by conformity to convention. In the summary of their interview results, Adorno et al. (1950) indicated that the sex roles of their high scorers were likely to be highly conventionalized. The authoritarian males tended to think of themselves in stereotypic macho ways: active, determined, energetic, rough, independent, and successful. The high scoring women tended to think of themselves in terms of conventional femininity: submissive and adulatory towards men. In addition, high scoring men tended to see women as passively subservient--thus enabling the men to assert their superiority over the women in a hierarchical chain of command. The fact that these sex roles are conventional makes them almost impervious to change because the roles receive powerful reinforcement from social mores expounded openly in the community in which the authoritarian lives. Especially potent, are the reinforcements that come from such long-standing institutions as ecclesiastical bodies, fraternal organizations and educational institutions.

In a study by Burr, Ahern, and Knowles (1977) it was found that the normative dimension of the marital relationship accounted for a considerable amount of the variance in conjugal power. Normative beliefs determined who had what power in the relationship significantly more than did the relative resources of the individual marriage partners.

Meissner (1991) indicated that masochistic individuals are prone to renounce love for the sake of power. The implication of this is that, if the authoritarian personality (i.e., sado-masochistic personality) develops sex roles which are socially normative, strongly reinforced by community ingroups, and sanctioned by

authoritative bodies like the church, then these roles will likely become reified in the minds of both partners in the marriage relationship--with the source of the authoritative ideology external to the person. If love is renounced for the sake of this power-based ideology, then the most potent motive for depth introspection and growth within the marital union is removed. As Fromm was quoted above, "Love is the productive form of relatedness to others and to oneself. It implies ... the wish for the other person to grow and develop" (1947, p. 110).

The next section of the paper deals with those pathological aspects of the authoritarian marriage which prevent growth and development. These are aspects of the relationship which are not love-based, but rather, are likely to stem from early privation of both love and instinctual satisfactions.

Authoritarian Personality: Its Marital Cycle of Privation

Privation is the absence of some quality or condition. The assertion made in this section is that the dynamics of the authoritarian marriage are often such as to create a cycle of privation--a cycle that denies the possibility of getting primary needs met. (Primary needs are those needs which give rise to the operation of primitive instinctual impulses and which must be satisfied or contained if development is to proceed uninhibited.) The cycle is privative precisely because these primary needs have never been met in the course of psychological development. The tendency of the authoritarian is to marry a spouse who, because of complementary needs of his or her own, will replicate original object relations in such a way as to maintain the status quo. In order to expound on this thesis, attention is given to: (a) the privative nature of the marital dyad and the shame that results from unmet dependency needs; (b) the authoritarian's tendency to compensate by emphasizing work, possessions, and social status; (c) the constriction of affective and sensual needs; and (d) the tendency to perpetuate the cycle through guilt and manic forms of reparation.

Unmet Dependency Needs and Shame in the Marital Dyad. Henry Dicks was one of the early psychoanalytic proponents of viewing the marital dyad as a dynamic unity. He described the deeper unconscious marital bonds as drawing the two spouses into a unit around which some sort of joint ego boundary is formed. His view was that all marriages are formed, in part, on the basis of realistically shared goals in the context of socially prescribed roles--and also in part, out of a need for complementariness (Dicks, 1967). He went on to define marital complementariness as being:

> a kind of division of function by which each partner supplied part of a set of qualities, the sum of which created a complete dyadic unit. This joint personality or integrate enabled each half to rediscover lost aspects of their primary object relations, which they had split off or repressed, and which they were, in their involvement with the spouse, re-experiencing by projective identification. The sense of belonging can be understood on the hypothesis that at deeper level[s] there are perceptions of the partner and consequent attitudes towards him or her as if the other was part of oneself. The partner is then treated according to how this aspect of oneself was valued: spoilt and cherished, or denigrated and persecuted. (1967, p. 69)

The authoritarian personality, once paired with a complementary spouse, will form a collusive system within the dyad in which shared internal split-objects will be projected and then reintrojected. This collusive system will allow for a polarization in the relationship in which one spouse will be experienced as representing what is lacking in the other spouse. Thus the complementary spouse would be experienced as an ego-alien, yet needed extension of the self. It has already been discussed how the authoritarian is prone to excessive splitting and projective identification in that he or she tends to function out of the paranoid/schizoid position. Dicks (1967) described a dyadic union which operates on the basis of those principles.

Earlier, research which bears upon the genetic factors associated with the authoritarian personality was addressed. It was found that the fathers of the male authoritarians tended to be perceived as stern, while the fathers of the females were

perceived as objects of exploitation. The mothers of the authoritarian men were viewed to be self-sacrificing and subservient (and thus exploited by the men), and the mothers of the women tended to be experienced as harshly restrictive. Each sex tended to view the parent of the opposite sex in some exploitative fashion, while the parent of the same sex seems to have been emotionally constricted and unavailable. This pattern would naturally set the stage for frustrated libidinal desires and, at the same time, a harsh and unbending conscience which results from internalizing the intolerant same-sex parent in undigested form.

According to Adorno et al. (1950), the authoritarian's ego-alien dependence upon others for material things represents a primitive unconscious desire to be cared for by the emotionally unavailable parents and a desire to exploit them (or the parent substitute). Rather than to trust the object to respond out of loving care, it seems that the authoritarian only learned to force the object--whether parent or spouse--to receive his or her needs by violently projecting them outward into the cathected object. In such a case, power supplants love as a means of eliciting a response from the object. In the words of Adorno et al. (1950), the adult "love" relationship looks like a dependence which is "essentially an exploitive-manipulative, externalized relationship. It is in contrast with what we have called love-seeking succorance-nurturance-affiliation with the parents"(p. 353).

It seems to follow that if one's parents or spouse are not attuned enough to meet one's primary needs out of a capacity for love and empathy, then the necessity of utilizing power to meet one's needs arises. However, this option is soon spoiled by the guilt which results from hostile phantasies imagined against the object. Furthermore, the needy child/spouse will feel shame at having such states of mind due to the fact that the projections have been intolerable to the object. This is a major factor in perpetuating the cycle of privation since it forces the needy spouse to split off parts of self and evacuate them all the more. This cycle undoubtedly

impoverishes the ego and deflates the self-esteem of the partners involved in such a privative relationship.

Although the terminology and concepts are different, the phenomenon of enhanced vs. diminished self-esteem due to equitable vs. authoritarian marital interaction may be hinted at in a study by Schafer, Keith, and Lorenz (1984). They found that perceived equity in the marital relationship was significantly correlated with the marriage partner's self-concept. However, the effect on the self-concept of the spouse was mediated by that spouse's perception of how the other partner appraised him or her. Equity in the relationship led to enhanced optimism about how well the spouses describe one another--and thus to increased self-esteem. In a similar study by Davidson (1984) it was found that perceptions of equity in the marital relationship were significantly correlated with marital adjustment for both spouses. Osmond and Martin (1978) also found that self-esteem was positively related to a democratic family leadership style while semi-autocratic and autocratic leadership style were associated with low self-esteem and fewer intact families. It appears that the authoritarian marital dyad will tend to be associated with low self-esteem while a relationship based on an ideology of equity between partners tends to enhance self-esteem and the esteem in which the partners perceive their spouse to hold them. It also appears that an equitable marriage relationship is associated with better marital adjustment.

The Compensatory Emphasis on Work, Things, and Social Status. As was reported above, the authoritarians' ego-alien dependence on others for things and support proved highly significant in differentiating them from the nonauthoritarians. This tendency was denied in the authoritarian personalities which were evaluated by Adorno et al. (1950). However, it was seen by the authors to be a pervasive tendency which caused the authoritarians to devalue human beings and to value physical objects to excess. At its most extreme, authoritarians

were noted to look upon people as if they were objects to be manipulated. This dynamic has the appearance of contempt for human relationships--the manic defense against dependency of which Hanna Segal has written (1974). As mentioned above, the study by Craddock (1977) showed that high authoritarian males devalue the very aspects of a spouse which are inherent in the traditional marriage relationship they are about to enter.

The authoritarian's tendency to use people for what he or she can get from them could also be seen in how sex is viewed. The authoritarian subjects tended to view sex as a means to attain status. This was statistically significant for both the men ($p < .05$) and the women ($p < .01$). The men tended to boast of their conquests or moralize in order to explain away embarrassing failures. The women tended to brag about their popularity or to boast of their prudish morality. Sexual relations for both high scoring men and women tend to be isolated and depersonalized--thus peripheral rather than ego-integrated. The interview data in Adorno et al. (1950) showed the thinly veiled contempt towards their sexual partners that was manifest in these authoritarian subjects.

Authoritarians were also found to be more concerned about social status than for the intrinsic worth of friendships. Adorno et al. found them to be concerned that their friends be prominent and that they come from the "right" social or economic status; nonauthoritarians accepted friends more on the basis of companionship and common interests. Associated with the emphasis on things and status are the authoritarians' strivings for success in their careers. While they did seem to exhibit remarkable ambition and drive, they did not seem to enjoy their work for its own sake. Work did not seem to be very libidinized (Adorno et al., 1950). Their drive for success and the accumulation of things may well have been an attempt to triumph over denied needs for dependency--especially the need to depend on the individual's spouse for help.

Constriction of the Affective and Sensual Domains in Marriage. There are many ways the authoritarian dyad has to act out its drama of externalized object relations. To explore all of the combinations would not be possible within the scope of the present paper. However, a few cases are used to illustrate some of the ways by which authoritarian couples constrict their awareness of the affective and sensual domains. Attention focuses on: (a) a form of reaction formation which infantilizes and shames the so-called "weaker sex," (b) the pure vs. bad woman split, (c) the "catch-22" of the sexual relationship, and (d) the privative part-object love of the authoritarian personality. The male will most often be described as the dominating marital partner, but this is not to be taken to imply that the reverse situation does not occur.

The first case is what Dicks (1967) called "knightly service to the Lady" (p. 145). This is a dynamic in which pseudo-admiration is profusely bestowed in a belittling manner upon the spouse--usually the wife--and the husband takes care of the "little lady." The wife is placed upon a pedestal and great care is taken not to make too many demands upon her--especially sexually. This is most often a reaction formation which denies shame-inducing disrespect and resentment against the opposite sex, that is, against a mother who was "too pure" to accept libidinal desires and/or "too frail" to accommodate the demands of a young son. It is clear in this case how the man's split off dependency needs would be projected into the woman and the how the woman would respond by exploiting the scant emotional resources of the man out of an unconscious greedy resentment over never having gotten enough provision. Here the woman accepts a variety of material provision as a substitute for genuine love. Adorno et al. (1950) found that this characteristic was common with authoritarians and that it distinguished them from the nonauthoritarians. The difference between the two groups of men was significant

($p < .01$). The difference between the women's groups was also significant but the difference was less marked ($p < .05$).

Dicks (1967) cautioned that the "knightly service to the Lady" pattern will most likely be quite dead in terms of dynamic movement within the relationship so long as the status quo prevails. The husband will not get his dependency needs met by the privative wife, and the wife will not become too aware of her greedy resentment as long as she allows herself to be shamelessly infantilized. However, due to envious resentments, the husband will likely blow-up with periodic rage. The hostile passivity of the woman, on the other hand, would probably motivate her to triangulate in the children, or other relatives, to exact revenge upon the husband for being so unreasonable as to stop providing--for even a moment--and for trying to get her to contain his rage and resentment. Until a blow-up occurs the husband and the wife will be able to deny their underlying needs and their seething resentments by putting them in the other spouse--thus no real growth is possible. At the point of the crisis, the projections are more apt to be withdrawn, and it is possible that an intervention could be made which would foster growth.

Another pattern, which Adorno et al. called the pure vs. bad woman split, is a way in which some authoritarians relate with their spouses so as to never have to integrate their split ambivalent feelings towards the opposite sex. Rather, dichotomous sex attitudes are developed in which the affects associated with sex are bifurcated (as is the libidinal object). This is commonly seen in the double standards maintained by many conservative authoritarians--especially men. The most glaring example is the bachelor party where the groom has his last fling with a prostitute the night before the honeymoon. Often, the unfaithful authoritarian groom holds open contempt for the woman the day after the "one night stand." This is clearly an attempt to evacuate his own forbidden sexual and aggressive impulses into her and then scorn her to avoid any sense of losing a valued internal

object. Adorno et al. (1950) found that authoritarians significantly differed ($p < .01$) from nonauthoritarians in respect to rigidly maintaining dichotomous sex attitudes. The nonauthoritarians were more likely to fuse sex and affect and thus increase self-awareness.

Sexual intercourse can only be meaningful to the degree it is entered into fully and only satisfying if it is engaged in passionately. The authoritarian personality is in a "catch-22" situation when it comes to the sexual relationship. No other aspect of an adult relationship involves such letting go of control, such passion, such awareness of self-insufficiency, such dependency, and such blurring of ego boundaries. Sexual intercourse is at once a tender act of containment and an aggressive act of intrusion. It can have a myriad of primitive phantasies associated with the act. All of this is anathema to the authoritarian personality who would try to keep such awareness split off. However, in sexual intercourse these experiences are brought together. Adorno et al. (1950) found that expressions of passionate love for sex partners were generally infrequent in their interviews with authoritarians.

It is likely that the authoritarian personality would have difficulty tolerating sexual experiences passionately directed towards a person who is "loved"--for sexual impulses are also aggressive in nature; especially for one who has given up on ruth (i.e., compassion and concern for the object) and unconsciously resorted to ruthless power-based manipulations in order to find need satisfaction. No, the authoritarian is much too defended to tolerate such depressive emotions as ambivalence, so the authoritarian splits his or her objects into parts. The pure vs. bad woman attitude is merely one of the more obvious splits. When such splitting occurs, the authoritarian will not be able to fully realize his or her own sexuality nor truly appreciate the different sex role of the spouse.

In a study of the relationship between sex role and marital adjustment, Peterson, Baucom, Elliott, and Farr (1989) found that femininity and masculinity correlated significantly with marital adjustment. Further, it was found that androgyny within the marital relationship was highly desirable, whereas marriages involving undifferentiated individuals were more likely to be distressed. In another study, by Baucom and Aiken (1984), it was found that femininity and masculinity were significantly correlated with self-reported marital satisfaction. It was also found that androgyny was the most frequent sex role identity among their nonclinic subjects. But for those couples receiving marriage counseling at the investigators' clinic, androgyny was the least frequent sex role identity for both males and females.

The authoritarian personality, due to excessive splitting of the marital object, will tend to engage in a privative type of part-object love. This is a love which may, for instance, use the woman as an ideal source of nurture and comfort--yet envy her for it. Obviously, such a man cannot truly enjoy his wife. This will tend to be a love which has intercourse with genitals and breasts rather than a love which can enjoy intercourse with a person with whom life is shared. This is also a selfish love from a husband who experiences the wife primarily in terms of what he will get out of the relationship. Thus it is a love which cannot easily give of itself. Adorno et al. (1950) found that the idea of having to "give" anything was very painful to most high scorers. For instance, high scorers tended to give to their parents out of duty--that is, to "make it up to them" (p. 355)--rather than from a freely expressed attitude of heart-felt love for their parents.

It was mentioned previously that Adorno et al. (1950) discovered the authoritarian tends to relate to people as things and it was hypothesized that authoritarians tended to relate to others as part-objects rather than whole persons. This form of social relationship may involve relating to others as suppliers of

physical goods, needed services, money, or body parts with which to have sex. In any case, the relationship is devoid of the satisfaction of relating to another as a whole person who possesses an independent mind, a feeling soul, and a personal body. It seems that such a relationship would involve an implicit denial of the fact that the other person may have limitations and needs of his or her own. The above hypothesis was supported by the results of a study by Rosenfeld and Plax (1975) who attempted to isolate correlates of personality variables associated with leadership style. It was found that the autocratic leader was associated with an object orientation. Autocratic leaders tended to blame others when things went wrong, lacked insight into self and others, manipulated others to the leaders' ends, did not consider the feelings of others, and did not make any show of treating others as persons. Democratic leaders displayed a people orientation, manifested insight into the motives and behaviors of self and others, related towards others with mutual respect as persons, worked with collaborators towards a goal and shared in the rewards and punishments accrued in the process. It appears obvious that the democratic style of leadership as described by Rosenfeld and Plax would be more emotionally satisfying than the autocratic form of leadership.

Perpetuating the Cycle with Guilt and Manic Reparation. When the authoritarian, utilizing a power-based system, treats people like things in order to get what is desired, the experience of interpersonal relationships becomes less and less satisfying. In the hierarchy of the marital relationship, the spouse can even assume a role similar to that of the outgroup, in that the spouse becomes the hated and controlled container for ego-alien aspects of the other's self. Through a paranoid system of projecting unwanted aspects of the self into one's spouse the marital relationship can become more and more oppressive and marked by increasingly hostile demand for mastery on the part of the sadistic spouse. Dicks (1967) claimed that struggle for mastery may be the key phenomenon from which

all other marital symptoms derive. This is especially true in dominance vs. submission conflicts:

> We see in such fights for ascendancy in the dyad a continuation of the old battle between a powerful "bad" parent figure and the "poor little self" projected and [introjected] from one to the other. The partner may be attacked as if he or she were a frustrator and detractor, thus "justifying" (displacing outwards by projection) the subject's own aggressive feelings towards the object, and warding off guilt at the failure of one's own role fulfillment. Only by attacking and controlling the projected powerful object that is felt to reside in the partner can the self avoid being controlled, devoured, or annihilated by the other. The variations of this model in practice are many, some crude and violent, some subtle and masked. (Dicks, 1967, p. 142)

In the overt struggle for dominance, the authoritarian can either exert him or her self as a cover for repressed passivity (the masochistic side), or passivity could be used as a defense against deeper aggression and hatred. Dominant, attacking attitudes (the sadist side) are based on the warding off of passive submission in the self, which the marital partner is compelled to assume as his or her role.

However, to the extent that this forceful process proceeds to escalate in the authoritarian dyad, phantasies of damage to the spouse also mount. This can produce an unbearable sort of depressive guilt. An authoritarian personality would probably defend against such guilt in one of two ways: First, a very destructive way would be to project this guilt into the spouse, thus allowing the relationship to further deteriorate. Secondly, the guilty authoritarian might engage in manic forms of reparation. This is an omnipotent process in which the guilty individual repairs the object--as if by magic--in such a way that no acknowledgment of wrong doing or guilty feelings occur (Segal, 1974). Often, the reparation is carried out in some way very distant from the object--for instance the husband might repair a leaking toilet for his wife after an unrelated fight with her. That way the authoritarian could feel everything is fixed and contained, could hold the object of repair in disgust, and could simultaneously feel free to approach his wife sexually

once more. (Whether his wife would feel a reciprocal freedom is doubtful.) At least this form may provide a cease-fire with the spouse.

The problem, however, with the manic reparation process is that it does not truly work. In reality, nothing occurs in manic reparation to correct the wrong, heal the interpersonal injury (through an expression of responsibility for one's own behavior and contrite sorrow for the injury), and thus remove the guilt which would bar reconciliation. But most importantly, the process itself is privative. The spouses are never really reconciled in a healing way. Thus, the pain which triggered the fight in the first place is never addressed. The only self-knowledge gained from the fight is that the spouse wanted nothing to do with that part which was in need of containment--and that knowledge breeds more shame. A cycle of shame is established which keeps the authoritarian dyad from enabling the individual spouses to grow in intimacy with one another or in personal depth.

## Implications for Therapy

The first implication for the therapist who would work with authoritarian couples is that it is important to remember the change that has occurred in the social role of women. The marriage role expectations of women in America have shown consistent movement from a role expectation dictated by traditional hierarchical family systems to a significantly more egalitarian role expectation (O'Neal Weeks & Gage, 1984; O'Neal Weeks & Botkin, 1987). Furthermore, it seems from the research cited earlier that even among traditional women there is a reluctance to marry into a hierarchical family system.

Second, it is important to realize from the start how resistant the authoritarian personality is bound to be to any kind of insight oriented therapy. The authoritarian will likely be resistant even to the thought of getting any type of treatment--much less individual analytically oriented treatment. With his or her

anti-intraceptive, extraceptive, and extra-punitive cognitive styles, the authoritarian is not likely to be attracted to depth oriented psychotherapy. Unfortunately, it is probably the form of treatment that would be the most efficacious--if the subject would make a commitment to persevere in it.

There is evidence that the authoritarian personality can be helped with intervention and is not necessarily intractable. Griffitt and Garcia (1979) experimentally showed that authoritarians could be impacted with a verbal conditioning process which significantly reduces their extra-punitive bias. However, these were laboratory findings. While an authoritarian may conceivably be more amenable to getting cognitive-behavioral therapy than analytically oriented treatment, it is doubtful whether it would greatly impact his or her character structure. However, for very discrete problems it might have a better chance at succeeding than would psychoanalytically oriented treatment.

For most difficulties, family therapy is probably the therapy of choice. First, family therapy does not have the painfully depriving elements which are present in individual psychoanalytic work and thus may offer more hope of retaining the patient(s) in treatment. Second, if the authoritarian is involved in a collusive marital relationship, it may be necessary to have both spouses in treatment in order to prevent envious attacks from the uninvolved spouse on the therapeutic relationship. Third, the authoritarian is so influenced by his overly enmeshed hierarchical family relationships that one viable approach to treatment would be to impact the authoritarian spouse or parent by intervening at the level of the authoritarian's family or marital system. Dicks (1967) was able to accomplish a considerable amount of work with couples using an analytic approach to conjoint therapy. Furthermore, the recent emergence of object relations family therapy also looks to hold promise. This approach might provide the authoritarian dyad with some measure of creative insight while supplying the necessary holding which

individual treatment may not possess because of possible difficulties in forming a therapeutic alliance.

## Summary

The authoritarian personality has been a topic of investigation since World War II when the Nazi scourge shocked the world with its ability to order people to commit atrocities. This paper sought to take the empirical literature of the past twenty years and integrate it with the comprehensive landmark study of The Authoritarian Personality by Adorno et al. (1950). The present study was undertaken assuming a similar analytic frame of reference to that which Adorno et al. accepted. The results of this integration of the empirical research revealed a cluster of characteristics which seem to form a syndrome known as the sado-masochistic or the authoritarian personality.

The characteristics of the authoritarian personality which were brought forward from the research and discussed were: conservatism, conventionality, passivity and conformity, rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity, inability to learn, omnipotence and superstition, idealism, intolerance of affection and sensuality, moralistic and extrapunitive hostility, ethnocentrism, and a preference for hierarchical relationships.

The defensive structure of the authoritarian personality was also examined. This proved to involve the defense mechanisms of splitting, idealization, projective identification, rigid denial, and repression. The more complex defenses of control, triumph, and contempt were also discussed as forms of manic defense. These defenses were found to be consistent with the paranoid/schizoid position.

After discussion of possible etiological factors related to the authoritarian's family of origin and environment, attention was turned to the integration of research which has a bearing on the authoritarian personality and marriage. The

authoritarian's paranoid/schizoid dynamics were discussed in terms of his or her basic manner of relating. Then the authoritarian's power orientation to marital relations was discussed. Finally, the cycle of privation which keeps the authoritarian mired in unsatisfying relationships was elucidated. It was shown that the authoritarian must cope with unmet dependency needs and shame. It was discussed how he or she compensates by triumphantly placing an emphasis on materialistic things in life. It was also shown how the authoritarian defensively constricts awareness of the affective and sensual domains while perpetuating the privative cycle of shame and guilt.

Finally, a brief section discussed the implications of treatment for the authoritarian personality and the marital dyad. It was concluded that the best approach to treatment would probably be a form of family or marital therapy which would utilize interpretive insight. This might take the form of a more classical psychoanalytic approach to conjoint therapy or a type of object relations therapy in either a marital or family format.

## REFERENCES


Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.

American Psychiatric Association (1985). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Antill, J. K., Cotton, S., & Tindale, S. (1983). Egalitarian or traditional: Correlates of the perception of an ideal marriage. Australian Journal of Psychology, 35, 245-257.

Baucom, D. H., & Aiken, P. A. (1984). Sex role identity, marital satisfaction, and response to behavioral marital therapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 438-444.

Berg, K. S., & Vidmar, N. (1975). Authoritarianism and recall of evidence about criminal behavior. Journal of Research in Personality, 9, 147-157.

Blanck, G., & Blanck, R. (1979). Ego psychology II: Psychoanalytic developmental psychology. New York: Columbia University Press.

Blood, R. O., Jr., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. New York: The Free Press.

Bond, M. P., & Vaillant, J. S. (1986). An empirical study of the relationship between diagnosis and defense style. Archives of General Psychiatry, 43, 285-288.

Boshier, R. (1973). An empirical investigation of the relationship between conservatism and superstition. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 12, 262-267.

Bowen, G. L., & Orthner, D. K. (1983). Sex-role congruency and marital quality. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 223-230.

Brant, W. D., Larsen, K. S., & Langenberg, D. (1978). Authoritarian traits as predictors of candidate preference in 1976 United States presidential election. Psychological Reports, 43, 313-314.

Bray, R. M., & Noble, A. M. (1978). Authoritarianism and decisions of mock juries: Evidence of jury bias and group polarization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1424- 1430.

Broderick, J. E., & O'Leary, K. D. (1986). Contributions of affect, attitudes, and behavior to marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 514-517.

Browning, D. L. (1983). Aspects of authoritarian attitudes in ego development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 137-144.

Burr, W. R., Ahern, L., & Knowles, E. M. (1977). An empirical test of Rodman's theory of resources in cultural context. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 505-514.

Burr, W. R., Hill, R., Nye, F. I., & Reiss, I. L. (Eds.). (1979). Contemporary theories about the family. New York: The Free Press.

Bush, D. F., Gallagher, B. J., III, & Weiner, W. (1982). Patterns of authoritarianism between generations. The Journal of Social Psychology, 116, 91-97.

Byrne, D., Cherry, F., Lamberth, J., & Mitchell, H. E. (1973). Husband-wife similarity in response to erotic stimuli. Journal of Personality, 41, 365-394.

Centers, R., Raven, B. H., & Rodriguez, A. (1971). Conjugal power structure: A re-examination. American Sociological Review, 36, 264-278.

Craddock, A. E. (1977). Relationships between authoritarianism, marital power expectations and marital value systems. Australian Journal of Psychology, 29, 211-221.

Davidson, B. (1984). A test of equity theory for marital adjustment. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47 (1), 36-42.

Dicks, H. V. (1967). Marital tensions: Clinical studies towards a psychoanalytic theory of interaction. New York: Basic Books.

Dielman, T. E., Barton, K., & Cattell, R. B. (1977). Relationships among family attitudes and child rearing practices. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 130, 105-112.

Downing, L. L., & Monaco, N. R. (1986). In group/out group bias as a function of differential contact and authoritarian personality. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 445-452.

Dovidio, J. F., Campbell, J. B., & Kahn, S. (1982). Authoritarianism and sex-related attributional biases. The Journal of Social Psychology, 118, 199-205.

Duckitt, J. (1983). Authoritarianism and adjustment in an authoritarian culture. The Journal of Social Psychology, 121, 211-212.

Eisenman, R. (1982). Sexual behavior as related to sex fantasies and experimental manipulation of authoritarianism and creativity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 853-860.

Fischer, E. H. (1973). Consistency among humanitarian and helping attitudes. Social Forces, 52, 157-166.

Fleming, W. (1966). Arts and ideas. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fromm, E. (1947). Man for himself. New York: Rinehart.

Fromm, E. (1964). The heart of man. New York: Harper & Row.

Fromm, E. (1969). Escape from freedom. New York: Avon Books.

Fromm, E. (1973). The anatomy of human destructiveness. New York: Fawcett Crest Books.

Garcia, L. T., & Griffitt, W. (1978). Authoritarianism-situation interactions in the determination of punitiveness: Engaging authoritarian ideology. Journal of Research in Personality, 12, 469-476.

Goldberg, C., & Evenbeck, S. (1976). Causal attribution of success and failure as a function of authoritarianism and sex. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 42, 499-510.

Gottman, J. M. (1979). Marital interaction: Experimental investigations. New York: Academic Press.

Gray-Little, B. (1982). Marital quality and power processes among black couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 633-646.

Griffitt, W., & Garcia, L. (1979). Reversing authoritarian punitiveness: The impact of verbal conditioning. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42 (1), 55-61.

Grossman, J. C., & Eisenman, R. (1971). Experimental manipulation of authoritarianism and its effects on creativity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 238-244.

Heaven, P. C. L. (1977). Do authoritarians hold authoritarian attitudes? The case of South Africa. The Journal of Psychology, 95, 169-171.

Heaven, P. C. L. (1986). Authoritarianism, directiveness and self-esteem revisited: A cross-cultural analysis. Personality and Individual Differences, 7, 225-228.

Heaven, P. C. L., Connors, J., & Trevethan, R. (1987). Authoritarianism and the EPQ. Personality and Individual Differences, 8, 677-680.

Heaven, P. C. L., & Furnham, A. (1987). Race prejudice and economic beliefs. The Journal of Social Psychology, 127, 483-489.

Heaven, P. C. L., & Stones, C. R. (1979). The relationship between authoritarian behavior and self-esteem. The Journal of Social Psychology, 109, 297-298.

Heinzen, T. E., Teevan, R. C., & Britt, M. A. (1988). Correlates of achievement, dominance, and creativity. Psychological Reports, 63, 443-446.

Hinshelwood, R. D. (1991). A dictionary of Kleinian thought (2nd ed.). Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson.

Hinsie, L. E., & Campbell, R.J. (1975). Psychiatric dictionary (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jabin, N. (1987). Attitudes towards disability: Horney's theory applied. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 47, 143-153.

Kelley, K. (1985). Sex, sex guilt, and authoritarianism: Differences in responses to explicit heterosexual and masturbatory slides. The Journal of Sex Research, 21, 68-85.

Kline, P., & Cooper, C. (1984). A factorial analysis of the authoritarian personality. British Journal of Psychology, 75, 171-178.

Kolb, T. M., & Straus, M. A. (1974). Marital power and marital happiness in relation to problem-solving ability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 756-765.

Kushell, E., & Newton, R. (1986). Gender, leadership style, and subordinate satisfaction: An experiment. Sex Roles, 14, 203-209.

Larsen, K. S., & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex-roles: Traditional or egalitarian? Sex Roles, 19, 1-12.

Leary, T. (1957). Interpersonal diagnosis of personality: A functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation. New York: Wiley.

Lindgren, H. C. (1974). Political conservatism and its social environment: An appraisal of the american presidential election of 1972. Psychological Reports, 34 (1), 55-62.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meissner, W. W. (1991). The phenomenology of religious psychopathology. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic: A Journal for the Mental Health Professions, 55, 281-298.

Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (1986). Social patterns of distress. Annual Review of Sociology, 12, 23-45.

Money-Kyrle, R. (Ed.). (1975). The writings of Melanie Klein (Vol. 3). New York: The Free Press.

O'Neal Weeks, M., & Botkin, D. R. (1987). A longitudinal study of the marriage role expectations of college women: 1961-1984. Sex Roles, 17, 49-58.

O'Neal Weeks, M., & Gage, B. A. (1984). A comparison of the marriage role expectations of college women enrolled in a functional marriage course in 1961, 1972, and 1978. Sex Roles, 11, 377-388.

Osmond, M. W., & Martin, P. Y. (1978). A contingency model of marital organization in low income families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 315-329.

Peterson, C. D., Baucom, D. H., Elliott, M. J., & Farr, P. A. (1989). The relationship between sex role identity and marital adjustment. Sex Roles, 21, 775-787.

Pursell, S., Banikiotes, P. G., & Sebastian, R. J. (1981). Androgyny and the perception of marital roles. Sex Roles, 7, 201-215.

Raden, D. (1980). Authoritarianism and overt aggression. Psychological Reports, 47, 452-454.

Rasmussen, D. G. (1986). Implications of psychodynamic theory for enhancing the conceptualization of marital power (Doctoral dissertation, Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 1331B.

Ray, J. J. (1976). Do authoritarians hold authoritarian attitudes? Human Relations, 29, 307-325.

Ray, J. J. (1979a). The authoritarian as measured by a personality scale: Solid citizen or misfit? Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35, 744-747.

Ray, J. J. (1979b). Authoritarianism in Australia, England and Scotland. The Journal of Social Psychology, 108, 271-272.

Ray, J. J. (1980a). Authoritarian tolerance. The Journal of Social Psychology, 111, 303-304.

Ray, J. J. (1980b). Authoritarianism and hostility. The Journal of Social Psychology, 112, 307-308.

Ray, J. J. (1980c). Authoritarianism in California 30 years later -with some cross-cultural comparisons. The Journal of Social Psychology, 111, 9-17.

Ray, J. J. (1981). Authoritarianism, dominance and assertiveness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 45, 390-397.

Ray, J. J. (1984). Authoritarianism and interpersonal spacing behavior. Personality and Individual Differences, 5, 601-602.

Ray, J. J. (1985). Using multiple class indicators to examine working-class ideology. Personality and Individual Differences, 6, 557-562.

Ray, J. J. (1986). Assertiveness as authoritarianism and dominance. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 809-810.

Ray, J. J., & Lovejoy, F. H. (1983). The behavioral validity of some recent measures of authoritarianism. The Journal of Social Psychology, 120, 91-99.

Ray, J. J., & Simons, L. A. (1982). Is authoritarianism the main element of the coronary-prone personality? British Journal of Medical Psychology, 55, 215-218.

Richmond, M. L. (1976). Beyond resource theory: Another look at factors enabling women to affect family interaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 257-266.

Rigby, K., & Rump, E. E. (1982). Attitudes toward authority and authoritarian personality characteristics. The Journal of Social Psychology, 116, 61-72.

Rosenfeld, L. B., & Plax, T. G. (1975). Personality determinants of autocratic and democratic leadership. Speech Monographs, 42, 203-208.

Ryckman, R. M., Burns, M. J., & Robbins, M. A. (1986). Authoritarianism and sentencing strategies for low and high severity crimes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12, 227-235.

Sales, S. M. (1973). Threat as a factor in authoritarianism: An analysis of archival data. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28, 44-57.

Sales, S. M., & Friend, K. E. (1973). Success and failure as determinants of level of authoritarianism. Behavioral Science, 16, 163-172.

Schafer, R. B., Keith, P. M., & Lorenz, F. O. (1984). Equity/inequity and the self concept: An interactionist analysis. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 42-49.

Segal, H. (1974). Introduction to the world of Melanie Klein (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Shiklar, R. (1975). Authoritarianism and political behavior: The 1972 election. Psychological Reports, 36, 874.

Siegel, J. M., & Mitchell, H. E. (1979). The influence of expectancy violations, sex, and authoritarianism on simulated trial outcomes. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 10, 37-47.

Sprenkle, D. H., & Olson, D. H. L. (1978). Circumplex model of marital systems: An empirical study of clinic and nonclinic couples. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 4, 59-74.

Wesley, R. B., Hill, R., Nye, F. I., & Reiss, I. L. (Eds.). (1979). Contemporary theories about the family. New York: The Free Press.

Wright, G. N., & Phillips, L. D. (1979). Personality and probabilistic thinking: An exploratory study. British Journal of Psychology, 70, 295-303.

Yonge, G. D., & Regan, M. C. (1978). Female sex-role expectations and authoritarianism. Psychological Reports, 43, 415-418.

Zacker, J. (1973). Authoritarian avoidance of ambiguity. Psychological Reports, 33, 901-902.

VITA

NAME

Reginald Lee Veurink

EDUCATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rosemead School of Psychology<br>Clinical Psychology | Psy. D. | (Cand.) |
| Rosemead School of Psychology<br>Clinical Psychology | M.A. | 1985 |
| Fuller Theological Seminary<br>Theology | M.Div. | 1983 |
| Siena Heights College<br>Guidance and Counseling | M.A. | 1974 |
| Hillsdale College<br>Psychology / Pre.Med. | B.S. | 1973 |

APA APPROVED INTERNSHIP

| | |
|---|---|
| Camarillo State Hospital | 1987 - 1988 |

PRACTICA IN PSYCHOLOGY

| | |
|---|---|
| Camarillo State Hospital<br>Inpatient evaluation and counseling | 1985 |
| Beck Psychiatric Medical Group<br>Outpatient evaluation and counseling | 1984 - 1985 |
| Saugus Union School District<br>School Psychology Trainee | 1984 |

EMPLOYMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Private Counseling Practice<br>Marriage, Family and Child Counselor | 1979 - present |
| Santa Clarita Christian Counseling Service<br>Marriage, Family and Child Counselor | 1980 - 1984 |
| Baw Beese Mental Health Center<br>Mental Health Counselor / Director, Day Treatment | 1974 - 1975 |